

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



121 573

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

905 A61 1916

Kansas City Public Library



This Volume is for
REFERENCE USE ONLY

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER
1916

ALL THE VOLUMES OF THE NEW SERIES OF THE
ANNUAL REGISTER
1863 to 1915

MAY BE HAD

Price 16s. net each.

ANNUAL REGISTER

A

REVIEW OF PUBLIC EVENTS AT HOME

AND ABROAD

FOR THE YEAR

1916

NEW SERIES

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, & CO., LTD.; S. G. MADGWICK

SMITH, ELDER, & CO.; J. & E. BUMPUS, LTD.

BICKERS & SON; J. WHELDON & CO.; R. & T. WASHBOURNE, LTD.

1917

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE EUROPEAN WAR.

CHAPTER I.

NEW YEAR TO THE MIDDLE OF MAY.

The Military Situation, [1]. The War of Attrition, [3]. Man-power of the Belligerents, [3]. Gross Casualties of the Belligerents, [4]. Accessions of Strength, [6]. Net Wastage of the Belligerents, [6]. The Russian Victories in the Middle East, [8]. The Great German Reverse at Verdun, [9].

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE MIDDLE OF MAY TO THE FALL OF GORIZIA.

Stagnation in the Russian Theatre, [11]. Austro-Hungarian Offensive in Tyrol, [11]. Austrians Capture Arsiero and Ariago, [13]. General Brussiloff's Great Offensive in Volhynia, [14]. Failure of the Russian Move on Kovel, [15]. Russians Capture Czernovitz for the Third Time, [16]. Heavy Austro-Hungarian Losses, [18]. The War at Sea, [19]. The British Blockade of Central Europe, [19]. Raids by the *Möwe*, [21]. Battle of Jutland, [22]. German and British Ships Sunk, [26]. Withdrawal of the Declaration of London, [27]. Franco-British Offensive on the Somme, [27]. Objectives of the Offensive, [28]. Progress of the Battle, [30]. Italian Conquest of Gorizia, [32].

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE CAPTURE OF GORIZIA TO THE END OF THE YEAR.

The Western Theatre, [34]. British Capture Comblès, [34]. Balkan Campaign, [35]. Italian Theatre, [35]. Russian Theatre, [35]. War in Armenia, [36]. War in the Air, [36]. Destruction of Zeppelins, [37]. War at Sea, [39]. The Rumanian Campaign, [40]. Early Rumanian Successes, [41]. Marshal v. Hindenburg, [42]. Clever German Strategy, [43]. Mackensen in the Dobrudja, [43]. Germans Capture Constanza, [45]. Decisive German Victory at Tîrgu-Jiu, [46]. Fall of Bukarest, [47]. War of Attrition, [47]. German Casualties, [48].

CONTENTS.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

THE END OF THE SESSION.

Question of Compulsory Military Service, [49]. Resignation of Sir John Simon, [49]. Result of the Derby Scheme, [49]. The Suppression of *Forward*, [49]. Munitions of War (Amendment) Bill, [50]. Introduction of Compulsory Military Service Bill, [51]. Second Reading, [52]. Committee Stage, [54]. Conscientious Objectors, [55]. Third Reading, [56]. The Bill in the Lords, [56]. Labour Party Conference, [57]. The *Baralong* Case, [58]. The Sinking of the *Persia*, [59]. Free Trade and Tariff Reform, [60]. Parliamentary Registration Bill, [61]. The German Blockade, [61]. Prorogation of Parliament, [64].

CHAPTER II.

THE NEW SESSION.

Closing of Galleries and Museums, [64]. Free Trade at Manchester, [65]. Opening of Parliament, [65]. Amendment to the Address, [66]. Air Defence, [67]. Reduction of Imports, [68]. The Question of Freights, [69]. The German Blockade, [69]. Votes of Credit, [71]. Economy Campaign, [72]. The Question of Peace, [74]. Trade after the War, [75]. The Military Service Act, [76]. Navy Estimates, [79]. Speech by Mr. Churchill, [80]. Air Debate, [81]. Bye-Election in the E. Herts Division, [83]. Army Estimates, [83]. Air Service, [84]. Recruiting Debate, [85]. Suggested Extension of the Military Service Act, [87]. Propaganda for Universal Compulsion, [88]. Trade after the War, [89]. Speeches by Mr. Hughes, [89]. Air Defence, [90]. Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill, [91]. Defence of the Realm Act, [92]. The Mesopotamia Operations, [93]. Strikes on the Clyde, [94]. Conference at Paris, [96]. The German Blockade, [96]. Introduction of the Budget, [97]. Estimated Revenue and Expenditure, [99-100]. Finance (New Duties) Bill, [101]. Withdrawal of the Travelling Tax, [102]. Debate on the Paris Conference, [103]. Speeches by Mr. Hughes, [103]. The Wittenburg Camp, [104]. Civil Obligations of Recruits, [105]. Propaganda for Conscription, [107]. Indecision of the Government, [108]. Agreement Reached, [109]. Leakage of Cabinet Secrets, [109]. Air Defence, [110]. Speech by Mr. Asquith, [110]. Bye-Election at Wimbledon, [111].

CHAPTER III.

THE SUMMER MONTHS.

Secret Sessions of Parliament, [111]. The Government Proposals, [112]. New Military Service Bill, [113]. Committee Stage, [114]. Report Stage, [115]. The Bill in the Lords, [116]. Cabinet Secrets, [117]. Rebellion in Ireland, [118]. Proclamation of Martial Law in Ireland, [119]. Suppression of the Rebellion, [120]. Mr. Birrell's Apology, [121]. Daylight Saving Bill, [122]. Air Defence, [123]. In the Lords, [125]. Second Reading of the Finance Bill, [126]. Eleventh Vote of Credit, [127]. Taxation of Dollar Securities, [128]. The Situation in Ireland, [129]. Execution of Rebels, [130]. Mr. Asquith's Visit to Ireland, [131]. The Question of Peace Negotiations, [132]. Vote for the Board of Agriculture, [133]. Army Organisation, [134]. Adjournment for the Whitsuntide Recess, [134]. Death of Lord Kitchener, [135]. The Paris Economic Conference, [136]. Re-opening of Parliament, [137]. Committee Stage of the Finance Bill, [137]. Royal Commission on the Irish Rebellion, [138]. Trial of Sir Roger Casement, [139]. Proposals for an Irish Settlement, [140]. Resignation of Lord Selborne, [141]. Debate on Irish Government, [142]. The Exclusion of Ulster, [144]. Breakdown of the Negotiations, [145]. The Camp at Ruhleben, [146]. Exchange of Prisoners, [147]. Declaration of London Abandoned, [148]. Post Office

CONTENTS.

vii

Vote, [149]. Mr. Lloyd George as Minister for War, [149]. Mesopotamia and the Dardanelles, [149]. The Question of a General Election, [152]. Third Reading of the Finance Bill, [153]. Our System of Education, [153]. Twelfth Vote of Credit, [154]. The Sale of Cocaine, [154]. Public Holidays, [155]. Execution of Captain Fryatt, [156]. Colonial Office Vote, [156]. Debate on the Paris Conference, [157]. Report on the Air Service, [158]. Third Year of the War, [159]. Changes in the Cabinet, [159]. Supplementary Pensions, [160]. Civil Service Estimates, [161]. The Life of Parliament, [162]. Special Register Bill, [163]. Work of the Munitions Ministry, [164]. Adjournment of Parliament, [165]. Discontent among Railway Workers, [166]. Trades Union Congress, [167]. Rounding up Men of Military Age, [169]. Combing Out, [170]. Conscription for Ireland, [170]. Interview with Mr. Lloyd George, [171]. Food Prices, [171].

CHAPTER IV.

THE RECONSTRUCTION.

The Re-assembling of Parliament, [172]. Debate on Food Prices, [172]. Government Shipping Operations, [173]. Mr. Lloyd George on Man-power, [173]. Fourth Vote of Credit, [174]. The Death of Mr. Sheehy Skeffington, [175]. The Government of Ireland, [175]. Speech by Sir William Robertson, [177]. The Output of Coal, [178]. Exchange of Civilian Prisoners, [179]. The Camp at Gardelegen, [179]. Early Closing of Shops, [180]. Air Service, [180]. Substitution Scheme, [181]. Sale of Nigerian Properties, [181]. Special Register Bill, [182]. Ministers and Journalists, [183]. The Lord Mayor's Banquet, [184]. Peace Meeting at Cardiff, [184]. War Pensions Bill, [185]. Control of Food Prices, [187]. New Food Regulations, [189]. Speech by Lord Northcliffe, [190]. National Gallery Bill, [190]. The South Wales Coal Fields, [191]. German Mission to Afghanistan, [192]. Debate on Naval Strategy, [192]. Combing Out, [194]. The Volunteer Bill, [195]. Changes at the Admiralty, [196]. Memorandum by Mr. Lloyd George, [197]. Resignation of Mr. Asquith, [197]. Mr. Lloyd George forms a Ministry, [198]. List of the New Ministry, [199]. List of Under-Secretaries, [200]. Parliamentary Secretaries, [201]. The New Ministers, [202]. Strike of Boilermakers, [203]. German Overtures of Peace, [203]. Mr. Lloyd George's Statement of Policy, [204]. Government Control of Shipping and Mining, [204]. Mobilisation of Civilian Labour, [205]. Statement by Lord Curzon, [206]. Fifth Vote of Credit, [207]. Irish Debate, [207]. Food Control, [208]. The German Peace Proposals, [209]. Note from the United States, [210]. Reply of the Allies, [211]. Invitation to Colonial Prime Ministers, [214]. End of the Year, [214].

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY *page* [216]

CHAPTER II.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY [229]

CHAPTER III.

RUSSIA, TURKEY, AND THE MINOR STATES OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE . [257]

CHAPTER IV.

LESSER STATES OF WESTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE: BELGIUM—LUXEM-
BURG—THE NETHERLANDS—SWITZERLAND—SPAIN—PORTUGAL—DEN-
MARK—SWEDEN—NORWAY [282]

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER V.

SOUTHERN ASIA : CYPRUS—PERSIA—AFGHANISTAN—INDIA—CEYLON	page [298
--	-----------

CHAPTER VI.

THE FAR EAST: CHINA—JAPAN	[306
-------------------------------------	------

CHAPTER VII.

AFRICA : THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA—RHODESIA—NYASSALAND—PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA—CAMEROON—TOGOLAND—NIGERIA—BRITISH EAST AFRICA AND GERMAN EAST AFRICA—THE BELGIAN CONGO—MOROCCO—ABYSSINIA—EGYPT—SUDAN	[312
--	------

CHAPTER VIII.

AMERICA: THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ITS DEPENDENCIES—CANADA—NEWFOUNDLAND—MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA—THE WEST INDIES AND THE GUIANAS—SOUTH AMERICA	[322
---	------

CHAPTER IX.

AUSTRALASIA: THE AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH—NEW ZEALAND	[354
--	------

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS IN 1916	page 1
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS	27
Summary of the Report of the Royal Commission on Venereal Diseases, 27. Withdrawal of Troops from Gallipoli, 31. Correspondence between the United States and Germany on the sinking of the <i>Sussex</i> , 45. The Bryce Report, 54. The Conquest of Cameroon, 68. Suppression of the Irish Rebellion, 70. Report of the Royal Commission on the Irish Rebellion, 78.	
RETROSPECT OF THE YEAR'S LITERATURE, SCIENCE, ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC	89
FINANCE AND COMMERCE IN 1916	145
OBITUARY OF EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1916	153
INDEX	209

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE Editor of the ANNUAL REGISTER thinks it necessary to state that in no case does he claim to offer original reports of speeches in Parliament or elsewhere. He has much pleasure in acknowledging his indebtedness to *The Times* for the special permission afforded him to make use of its Parliamentary reports and other matter ; and he hereby expresses his thanks to that journal for the valuable assistance which he has derived from the facilities thus extended to him.

In deference to the criticisms of reviewers, the section dealing with Public Documents is more varied and slightly longer than it was last year ; as before, special attention has been given to the Retrospect of the Year's Literature.

The Editor may perhaps be permitted once again to mention the singular difficulties experienced in the collection and sorting of news from all parts of the world. In almost all countries the course of political evolution is dominated by the events of the war ; for it is recognised everywhere that the future of humanity depends more upon the issue of that great struggle than upon any of the minor problems which divide parties in normal times.

THE MINISTRY, 1916.

<i>Office.</i>	<i>Mr. Asquith's Ministry.</i>	<i>Mr. Lloyd George's Ministry.</i>
<i>Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury . .</i>	Mr. Asquith.	Mr. Lloyd George.
<i>Minister without Portfolio</i>	Lord Lansdowne.	Lord Milner.
<i>Minister without Portfolio</i>	—	Mr. Henderson.
<i>Lord Chancellor . . .</i>	Lord Buckmaster.	Lord Finlay.
<i>Lord President of the Council . . .</i>	Lord Crewe.	Lord Curzon.
<i>Lord Privy Seal . . .</i>	Lord Curzon.	Lord Crawford.
<i>Chancellor of the Exchequer</i>	Mr. McKenna.	Mr. Bonar Law.
<i>Secretaries of State :—</i>		
<i>Home Affairs . . .</i>	Sir J. Simon (<i>resigned Jan. 1</i>).	
	Mr. H. Samuel.	Sir George Cave, K.C.
<i>Foreign Affairs . . .</i>	Viscount Grey.	Mr. Balfour.
<i>Colonies</i>	Mr. Bonar Law.	Mr. Long.
<i>India</i>	Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Chamberlain.
<i>War</i>	Lord Kitchener (<i>till June</i>).	
	Mr. Lloyd George.	Lord Derby.
<i>Minister of Munitions . .</i>	Mr. Lloyd George (<i>till June</i>).	
	Mr. Montagu.	Dr. Addison.
<i>Minister of Labour . . .</i>	—	Mr. Hodge.
<i>Pensions Minister . . .</i>	—	Mr. G. Barnes.
<i>Minister of Blockade . .</i>	Lord Robert Cecil, K.C.	Lord Robert Cecil, K.C.
<i>First Lord of the Admiralty</i>	Mr. Balfour.	Sir Edward Carson, K.C.
<i>President of the Air Ministry . . .</i>	—	Lord Cowdray.
<i>Food Controller</i>	—	Lord Devonport.
<i>Shipping Controller . .</i>	—	Sir J. P. Maclay, Bart.
<i>President of the Board of Trade</i>	Mr. Runciman.	Sir A. Stanley.
<i>President of the Local Government Board . .</i>	Mr. Long.	Lord Rhondda.
<i>Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster</i>	Mr. H. Samuel (<i>till Jan.</i>).	
	Mr. E. S. Montagu (<i>till July</i>).	Sir F. Cawley, Bart.
	Mr. McKinnon Wood.	
<i>Chief Secretary for Ireland</i>	Mr. Birrell (<i>till May</i>).	Mr. Duke, K.C.
	Mr. H. E. Duke, K.C.	
<i>Secretary for Scotland . .</i>	Mr. McKinnon Wood (<i>till July</i>).	Mr. Munro, K.C.
	Mr. Tennant.	
<i>President of the Board of Agriculture</i>	Lord Selborne (<i>till June</i>).	Mr. R. E. Prothero.
	Lord Crawford.	
<i>First Commissioner of Works</i>	Mr. Harcourt.	Sir A. Mond, Bart.
<i>President of the Board of Education</i>	Mr. Henderson (<i>till August</i>).	
	Lord Crewe.	Mr. H. A. L. Fisher.
<i>Attorney-General</i>	Sir F. E. Smith, K.C.	Sir F. E. Smith, K.C.
<i>Postmaster-General . . .</i>	Mr. H. Samuel (<i>till Jan.</i>).	
	Mr. J. A. Pease.	Mr. A. Illingworth.
<i>Solicitor-General</i>	Sir G. Cave, K.C.	Sir Gordon Hewart, K.C.

<i>Office.</i>		<i>Mr. Asquith's Ministry.</i>	<i>Mr. Lloyd George's Ministry.</i>
<i>Parl. Under-Secretaries:—</i>			
<i>Home Affairs</i> . . .		Mr. W. Brace.	Mr. W. Brace.
<i>Foreign Affairs</i> . . .		Lord Robert Cecil, K.C. Lord Newton.	Lord Robert Cecil, K.C. Mr. Steel-Maitland. Lord Islington.
<i>Colonies</i> . . .		Mr. Steel-Maitland.	
<i>India</i> . . .		Lord Islington.	
<i>War</i> . . .		Mr. Tennant (<i>till July</i>). Lord Derby.	Mr. J. I. Macpherson.
<i>Financial Secretaries:—</i>			
<i>To the Treasury</i> . . .		Mr. Montagu (<i>till Jan.</i>). Mr. McKinnon Wood.	Mr. S. H. Lever. Mr. H. W. Forster. Dr. Macnamara.
<i>To the War Office</i> . . .		Mr. H. W. Forster.	
<i>To the Admiralty</i> . . .		Dr. Macnamara.	
<i>Civil Lord of the Admiralty</i> . . .		The Duke of Devonshire (<i>till July</i>). Lord Lytton.	Mr. Pretymman.
<i>Parliamentary Secretaries:—</i>			
<i>Board of Trade</i> . . .		Mr. Pretymman.	Mr. G. H. Roberts.
<i>Local Govt. Board</i> . . .		Mr. Hayes Fisher.	Mr. Hayes Fisher.
<i>Board of Agriculture</i> . . .		Mr. Acland.	Sir R. Winfrey.
<i>Board of Education</i> . . .		Mr. Herbert Lewis.	Mr. Herbert Lewis.
<i>Munitions</i> . . .		Dr. Addison.	Sir L. Worthington Evans, Bart., and Mr. Kellaway. Sir A. Griffith Boscawen.
<i>Pensions</i> . . .		—	
<i>Ministry of Shipping</i> . . .		—	Sir L. G. Chiozza Money.
<i>Control</i> . . .		—	Mr. F. Leverton Harris.
<i>Ministry of Blockade</i> . . .		—	Mr. W. C. Bridgeman.
<i>Ministry of Labour</i> . . .		—	Capt. C. Bathurst.
<i>Food Control Dept.</i> . . .		—	Major Baird, C.M.G.
<i>Air Ministry</i> . . .		—	
<i>Paymaster-General</i> . . .		Lord Newton (<i>till August</i>). Mr. Henderson.	Sir J. Compton-Rickett.
<i>Assistant Postmaster-General</i> . . .		Mr. Pike Pease.	Mr. Pike Pease.
<i>Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury</i> . . .	Joint	Mr. Gulland. Lord Edmund Talbot.	Lord Edmund Talbot and the Hon. Neil Primrose.
<i>Lords Commissioner of the Treasury:—</i>			
		Mr. G. H. Roberts.	Mr. J. F. Hope.
		Mr. Howard.	—
		Mr. Bridgeman.	—
		Mr. Walter Rea (<i>unpaid</i>).	Mr. Pratt.
SCOTLAND.			
<i>Lord Advocate</i> . . .		Mr. Munro, K.C.	Mr. J. A. Clyde, K.C.
<i>Solicitor-General</i> . . .		Mr. Morison, K.C.	Mr. Morison, K.C.
IRELAND.			
<i>Lord Lieutenant</i> . . .		Lord Wimborne.	Lord Wimborne.
<i>Lord Chancellor</i> . . .		Sir I. J. O'Brien, K.C.	Sir I. J. O'Brien, K.C.

ANNUAL REGISTER

FOR THE YEAR

1916.

PART I.

THE EUROPEAN WAR.

CHAPTER I.

NEW YEAR TO THE MIDDLE OF MAY.

At the beginning of the year the geographic positions of the opposing armies in the Western Theatre of war were identical with those occupied by the forces twelve months earlier. The line of the German Armies still ran from the neighbourhood of Westende, east of Ypres, past La Bassée, Lens, and Arras, across the Somme, and turning eastward, ran past Rheims to Verdun, and then turning southward again, ran north-east of Nancy into Alsace, and so reached the Swiss frontier. (See A.R., 1915, p. 1.) During 1915 one great effort had been made by the Germans (near Ypres in April) to break this deadlock, and several similar attempts had been made by the French and British forces, but in every case the assaults had failed. In each of these offensives, the attacking armies had been able to gain a slight preliminary advantage, and had seized the advanced trenches of the defenders, but subsequently the assaults had broken themselves in vain against the second or third line of the defensive works, and the casualties of the attacking armies had always proved disproportionately heavy, especially in the case of the French offensive in Champagne in September. Thus the armies still faced one another in the lines which had been established in October, 1914, after the fall of Antwerp.

In the Eastern Theatre the course of the war had been very different. There the situation so far from having remained a deadlock had altered greatly during the previous twelve months, and to the advantage of the Central Empires. At the beginning of the year, the Austro-German line in Russia was

substantially that established at the end of September, after the great Russian retreat from Warsaw. This line began on the coast a few miles west of Riga, ran along the left bank of the Dvina, which it crossed at one spot, and passed close to Dvinsk, which, however, the Russians still held, in spite of frequent German assaults. At Dvinsk the German line left the course of the Dvina, and ran southwards to the neighbourhood of the junction of Molodetchno. The Germans held Smorgon, but not Molodetchno. The line continued southwards to Pinsk, cutting the main Warsaw-Moscow railway a few miles east of the junction of Baranovitché, about fifty miles west of Minsk. In the neighbourhood of Pinsk the line entered the region of the enormous Pripet Marshes, and was therefore less continuous and less strongly held in this district. Indeed, the Pripet Marshes virtually divided the Eastern Theatre into two distinct spheres, the northern being mainly held by German troops and the southern chiefly by Austro-Hungarian forces. In Volhynia the Austro-Germans held Luck and Dubno, but neither Rovno nor Sarny, these two towns never having been reached by the invaders. South of Dubno the line entered Galicia, a small segment of which the Russians still retained, and ended on the Rumanian frontier, the Austrians having retaken Czernovitch in 1915.

The course of the war was not, however, to be judged solely by territorial advances and retreats. In the very early stages of the war, before the difficulties attending any offensive operations against an entrenched foe were realised, it was, indeed, hoped and expected in France and England that the Entente Armies would speedily out-manceuvre and overpower the Austro-German forces and would win victories strategically similar to those achieved by the successful commanders in the Napoleonic and Franco-German wars. And in its earliest phases the conflict really was, even in the West, a war of great movements, and this freedom of movement was never at any stage more than partially lost in the Eastern Theatre. But in the West, as already stated, there had been a deadlock ever since the fall of Antwerp. The entrenchment of opposing forces, equally well supplied with guns, reduced the scope of strategy, as distinct from tactics, almost to vanishing point. It was no longer possible for one army to out-manceuvre and destroy the other in a few days or a few weeks; and hence during 1915 students of military affairs in France and England had evolved a new scheme of victory. The war was to be a "war of attrition." It was pointed out that the number of men possessed by the Entente Powers was much greater than the number that the Central Powers could command. The war was therefore to be a crude process of sheer killing. And then, assuming that each side killed equally effectively, the Entente would reach victory in an inevitable manner through the working of a simple mathematical law, for the proportionate man-power of the two groups

of armies would be constantly altering to the disadvantage of the Central Empires, until at last the odds would become overwhelming, and the enemy would collapse. This was believed to be the theory adopted by Marshal Joffre and the French General Staff, and in considering the course of the war it is therefore fully as necessary to remember this question of exhaustion of man-power as to note the geographical and strategic changes which occurred in the various theatres from time to time.

THE WAR OF ATTRITION.

The series of tables which follows is intended to show how far the process of attrition had gone after a year and a half of war, or in other words, with what forces the two sides were able to enter upon the new year's campaigning. It should be noted that the statistics of casualties given here are approximately accurate only, not exact. The British casualties were known very accurately, and the French losses were published in England, in round figures, at the beginning of 1916. Also, if the lists and estimates published in Germany and Austria-Hungary be credited—and nearly all serious military writers credit them—the losses of the hostile Powers are known with a high degree of accuracy. In the case of Russia, however, there is a wider margin of uncertainty and exact figures were not available. The Russian losses in respect of killed and wounded up to the end of January were known, however, to have been somewhat greater than those of either Germany or Austria-Hungary severally, and in respect of prisoners much greater. In the following tables the German and Austro-Hungarian statistics of their own losses are accepted as true, as is also the German report of the number of Russian prisoners captured by the Central Powers, and hence the tables certainly do not give an unduly favourable picture of the Entente's position at this time. The first two tables show the man-power of the opposing sides at the beginning of the war, and it may be remarked that the efforts put forth by the Powers most strained were so great that the customary estimate of the maximum size of a nation's army, to wit, 10 per cent. of the population, was undoubtedly exceeded:—

TABLE I.

	Population.		Potential Army.
France - - - -	39,000,000	12 per cent. of population	4,680,000
Russia (excluding Tartar tribes) - - - -	145,000,000	12 " " "	17,400,000
Italy - - - -	35,000,000	12 " " "	4,270,000
Great Britain - - - -	42,000,000	10 " " "	4,200,000
Ireland - - - -	4,400,000	6 " " "	264,000
Canada - - - -	7,800,000	6 " " "	468,000
Australasia - - - -	6,000,000	6 " " "	360,000
Totals - - - -	<u>279,800,000</u>		<u>31,642,000</u>

TABLE II.

	Population.		Potential Army.
Germany - - -	68,000,000	12 per cent. of population	8,160,000
Austria-Hungary - - -	54,000,000	12 " " "	6,480,000
Bulgaria - - -	4,800,000	10 " " "	480,000
Totals - - -	<u>126,800,000</u>		<u>15,120,000</u>

It will be seen from these tables that the odds at the commencement of the war were rather more than 2 to 1. The problem is not, indeed, exhausted by a consideration of the populations given in the tables. London, Paris, and Petrograd hold dominion over vast countries inhabited by myriads of coloured men. But these subject races contributed only a very low percentage of soldiers. For instance, the immensely populous but extremely weak Empire of India raised in the first eighteen months about one hundredth the number of soldiers that would have been expected from her if she had been a martial European state. Many millions of these coloured people were quite unwarlike. And moreover, the possession of vast subject populations by Great Britain and France was largely counter-balanced by the fact that Germany and Austria-Hungary had in Turkey an Asiatic vassal whose population, though much smaller, was of much higher military quality. Hence for practical purposes it is only necessary to consider the white populations, as set out above.

In its simplest form this problem of attrition consists of course in ascertaining the gross casualties of the two great composite armies, then deducting the accessions of men from the gross casualties, and finally deducting the net losses from the original totals of the armies. The accessions consist of the wounded who recover and of the youths who in every state continually reach military age. In a war lasting for several years this latter factor is a very important one. It is true that against this mechanical effect of the mere passage of time must be placed the fact that such of the oldest soldiers as are not killed will pass the upper age limit, and therefore (even if not discharged) depreciate in military value. But this is in any case a much smaller factor in the calculations, and in practice the Governments for the most part retained these men with the colours.

Tables III. and IV. show the approximate gross casualties of the chief Powers in the first year and a half of the war.

TABLE III.

	Killed and Died.	Prisoners and Missing.	Wounded.	Totals.
France - - - - -	720,000	300,000	1,400,000	2,420,000
Russia - - - - -	1,100,000	1,600,000	2,200,000	4,900,000
United Kingdom - - -	110,000	60,000	300,000	470,000
British Dominions - -	18,000	10,000	50,000	78,000
	<u>1,948,000</u>	<u>1,970,000</u>	<u>3,950,000</u>	<u>7,868,000</u>

TABLE IV.

	Killed and Died.	Prisoners and Missing.	Wounded.	Totals.
Germany - - - -	760,000	220,000	1,570,000	2,550,000
Austria-Hungary - - -	700,000	650,000	1,500,000	2,850,000
	<u>1,460,000</u>	<u>870,000</u>	<u>3,070,000</u>	<u>5,400,000</u>

The losses suffered by the French and British coloured troops are, of course, not included in the above figures. The French casualties had been very serious at the beginning of the war (when nearly all the prisoners were lost) and again during the unsuccessful offensive in Champagne in September and October, 1915. It will be noticed that the British figures show a singularly high proportion of wounded; this is probably due to the fact that very slight injuries were included in the British lists, but did not find a place in the German and French casualties. In the German lists the "missing" were recorded quite separately from prisoners; in Table IV. half the missing have been classed as dead, and half as prisoners. Throughout the first eighteen months the Austro-Hungarian losses were reported to have been slightly behind those of Germany in the matter of killed and wounded, but in respect of prisoners much greater.

It is instructive to compare the efforts which were being made early in the year by these Powers in order to make good their losses. All the four great land-powers had then called up the 1917 class of recruits, and Austria-Hungary had called up the 1918 class as well. It should be remembered, however, that this 1917 class consisted of men of 19, who therefore corresponded (though not exactly) to Groups 2 and 25 of the so-called Derby Scheme in Great Britain. Derby Group No. 2 was called to the colours in January, so that the British were taking essentially the same measures as the other four Powers. At the other end of the scale, the French had called out all men up to 48, but this was the normal limit in France. In Austria-Hungary all men up to 55 had been made liable for service, the normal limit being 42, and the oldest classes of these recruits were called up early in the year. Neither the Russians nor the Germans had found it necessary to raise their age-limits, which were 43 and 45 respectively, and the German Government even claimed that it was discharging soldiers who reached the age of 45. In Great Britain the age-limit was 41.

It is next necessary to find what deductions must be made from the gross casualties in order to arrive at the net wastage. The French Medical Service reckoned that 50 per cent. of their wounded returned to the ranks, and this may be taken as the average for the other belligerents, except the British, among whom a somewhat higher proportion of recoveries must presumably be allowed for, owing to very slight wounds being officially included in the British casualties. The Germans claimed that the proportion of their recoveries was higher than

50 per cent., but the claim may be disregarded. There was also Nature's reinforcement, which up to the date now under consideration consisted of $1\frac{1}{2}$ "classes" of young men, the youths who reached military age in a year and a half. The following tables show these reinforcements :—

TABLE V.

	Wounded	Recovered.	Youths.	Totals.
France - - - - -	700,000	360,000	1,060,000	
Russia - - - - -	1,100,000	1,300,000	2,400,000	
United Kingdom - - - - -	180,000	200,000 (?)	380,000	
British Dominions - - - - -	30,000	100,000	130,000	
	<u>2,010,000</u>	<u>1,960,000</u>	<u>3,970,000</u>	

TABLE VI.

	Wounded	Recovered.	Youths.	Totals.
Germany - - - - -	785,000	640,000	1,425,000	
Austria-Hungary - - - - -	750,000	500,000	1,250,000	
	<u>1,535,000</u>	<u>1,140,000</u>	<u>2,675,000</u>	

A few words in explanation of these tables are necessary. The reinforcement of British youths has been reduced by 50 per cent., because in the case of Great Britain this reinforcement was largely counter-balanced by men (civilians) passing above the age-limit, and thus, owing to the very partial mobilisation of British manhood, becoming unavailable. The statistics of youths in Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary are not based upon the peace-time strength of a "class," but upon the population statistics, because in peace-time those countries, unlike France, did not enrol by any means the total number of young men available. Italy has been ignored in the later tables. The Italian losses had been very small (smaller even than those of Great Britain), the reserves had been only partially mobilised, and the reinforcement of youths was partly counter-balanced, as in Great Britain, by men passing above the legal age-limit. The strength of the Italian Army may therefore be taken as having been stationary. The Bulgarian losses are also negligible. The net results of attrition during the first eighteen months have now been found as follows :—

Gross casualties of Entente - - - - -	7,868,000
Reinforcements - - - - -	<u>3,970,000</u>
Net wastage of Entente - - - - -	<u>3,898,000</u>
Gross casualties of Central Alliance - - - - -	5,400,000
Reinforcements - - - - -	<u>2,675,000</u>
Net wastage of Central Alliance - - - - -	<u>2,725,000</u>

This may be expressed in terms of the total strength of the armies as follows :—

Original strength of Entente	-	-	-	-	-	31,642,000
Wastage	-	-	-	-	-	3,898,000
Strength after eighteen months	-	-	-	-	-	<u>27,744,000</u>
Original strength of Central Alliance	-	-	-	-	-	15,120,000
Wastage	-	-	-	-	-	2,725,000
Strength after eighteen months	-	-	-	-	-	<u>12,395,000</u>

In other words, the Entente Army had been reduced by approximately 12·3 per cent., and that of the Central Powers by approximately 18 per cent. Thus the process of attrition had been markedly in favour of the Entente, since although the losses of the Entente had been actually greater, so long as the wastage continued to be *proportionately* less than that of the enemy, the odds against the latter would be continually increasing. The reader's attention may be called to the fact that if the destruction of the enemy's army continued at the same rate, it would take four years of war to reduce the hostile force to one half of its original strength. It is also instructive to note the wastage of the Powers individually. Thus the attrition of French manhood amounted even at this time to no less than 29 per cent., whilst the German Army had been reduced by slightly less than 14 per cent. The British wastage came only to a negligible quantity (theoretically about 2 per cent.), which could easily be made good by raising the upper age-limit by one year.

The Belgian and Serbian losses have not been included in the above tables. The aggregate man-power of these two nations was not less than 1,200,000, but fully 80 per cent. of their men had been put out of action by the end of 1915. If this figure were added to the Entente wastage, it would make an appreciable difference in the final results. In a just estimate of the process of attrition, however, the Belgian and Serbian casualties should be excluded. The Belgians and Serbians were caught isolated from the main masses of the Entente, and were overwhelmed, and in a national sense annihilated, without inflicting anything approaching proportionate damage upon the enemy. The conquest of these small nations was not part of the wearing-down of the main forces of the Entente. It is true that if the loss of Belgian and Serbian man-power be excluded from the reckoning, to be strictly fair the Austro-German casualties incurred in conquering those peoples ought also to be excluded; but the enemy's casualties in those campaigns (even including the first Austro-Hungarian attack upon Serbia) were too inconsiderable to affect appreciably the mathematical result obtained above. If Belgium and Serbia had been included, the net wastage of the Entente would have amounted to nearly 14 per cent., but as already stated that would give a distorted impression of the wasting process.

THE RUSSIAN ADVANCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

During the first four months of the year there was a striking recrudescence of Russian activity in the Caucasus. After nearly a year of stagnation the Russians again took the offensive, and advancing in the depth of winter, captured Erzerum by storm, notwithstanding that this town was one of the strongest fortresses in the Ottoman Empire. The area in the Middle East which was being fought over was of enormous extent, for the Armenian and Persian operations were parts of a single campaign, and these regions constituted one theatre of war. North-east of Erzerum the Turks had maintained a successful defence for a year, their lines being in the neighbourhood of the frontier; but further east, between Lakes Van and Urmia, the Muscovites had been steadily expanding into Turkish territory throughout 1915. On January 11 and 12 the Grand-Duke Nicholas, who was now in command here, struck a forceful blow at the Ottoman lines and succeeded in breaking through. Ten days later the Russians reached the outskirts of Erzerum, which lies about 70 miles from the frontier. The detailed story of this winter campaign, when it is made known to the world after the war, is certain to prove extremely interesting and highly creditable to the Grand-Duke and his troops. The march through the snows was a truly wonderful feat, for the natural difficulties of the terrain were comparable only to those that the Italian Army had to face in Tyrol. The strength of the Russian force operating in the immediate vicinity of the great Armenian fortress was not revealed, but having regard to the numbers engaged in this region twelve months earlier, there is little doubt that the Grand-Duke employed at least five army corps. The siege-guns were brought through the mountains, and on February 11 the bombardment began in earnest. On the 14th one of the forts on the Turkish left flank was reduced, and after this breach in the defences, the forts were stormed in rapid succession, and on February 16 the Russian commander was able to announce that he had captured Erzerum. A large part of the Turkish garrison succeeded in escaping, however, for the fortress was not invested, but 323 guns and 13,000 prisoners were taken.

This victory, occurring as it did in a theatre of war which was quite as important as the Balkans, was the greatest success which had been achieved by the Entente Armies since the Russians reduced Przemyśl. The Russian front in the Middle East at this time extended a distance of about 800 miles, but it was not, of course, a continuous entrenched line, such as existed in the main theatres of war. The Russians had been in occupation of North-western Persia before the war, and throughout 1915 they had been advancing in that region. Simultaneously with the advance in Armenia, the Muscovites fought their way south in Persia, and at the beginning of March they occupied Kermanshah in force. Thus after the fall of Erzerum the

Russian line ran as follows: It began on the Black Sea coast about 30 miles within the Turkish frontier, ran south of Erzerum, through Mush, south of Lake Van and south of Lake Urmia, and then turning more southward ran inside Persian territory to Kermanshah, and then curving more eastward again, terminated in the neighbourhood of Ispahan.

After their victories in February, the Russians continued to press on, and in view of the geographical difficulties, their progress was not slow. A strong contingent advanced along the Black Sea coast, and on April 6 reached the Kara Dere River, situated about 18 miles from Trebizond. This position had been fortified by the Turks, but after several days' hard fighting, the Russians broke through on April 15. After this defeat the Ottoman commander did not attempt to hold Trebizond, which was also threatened by a Russian force landed to the west of the town, and on April 18 the victorious invaders entered this important port. The possession of Trebizond was thereafter of great service to the Russians, as it enabled them to supply their armies by the sea route.

THE BATTLE OF VERDUN.

Early in the year the Germans found that winter and their own successes had temporarily freed them from all anxiety on their Russian and Balkan fronts, and the Imperial General Staff therefore decided that the time had once more come when they could batter at the French lines with all the means at their disposal. The German Government believed that it had found an excellent opportunity to attack the weakest, the most sorely wounded, of the three chief enemies of Germany. And it was true that France had suffered very severely. Not her field army merely, but her total available manhood had been reduced by nearly one-third. The French Army was now less than half the size of that of Germany, albeit the German Army had fully double the amount of work to do. The German General Staff thought that if it could deal one deadly blow at the French line, and break it, then the French Army would probably collapse, and France would be compelled to make a separate peace. The point selected for the new offensive was Verdun, where the Crown Prince of Prussia was in command—at least nominally. Verdun was a strong position, but it had this advantage from the German point of view, that once the town and its surrounding fortresses were taken, it was believed that no other equally defensible position would intervene between the German Army and Paris. The chance of capturing Verdun might be small, but the stake was high and worth a gamble, for it appeared probable that the fall of Verdun would mean the fall of Paris, and the definite defeat of France.

The battle afforded but little scope for strategy, although each side was constantly learning new lessons in tactics. The German plan was merely that of a battering ram. The French

lines were subjected to a terrific bombardment, and this was followed by a general assault by infantry. The results were closely comparable to those of the Franco-British offensive in September, 1915. The general assault commenced on February 21, and at first met with considerable success. Due north of Verdun, at a distance of about 8 miles from the town, the enemy advanced. On the east bank of the Meuse, at and eastwards of Consenvoye, the first line of the French defence was broken, and the Germans took Brabant-sur-Meuse and Samogneux on the 24th. The battle extended eastwards, and at the height of the conflict the Germans were attacking along a front of about 25 miles. The French calculated that nearly half a million men took part in the first great assault, but at the time of writing this statement has not been confirmed from German sources. On the 25th the Douaumont Fort, a position which the Germans deemed of great tactical importance, was stormed by the 24th Brandenburg Infantry, a regiment with a high reputation for bravery. The enemy published this success with great enthusiasm, but although no doubt the Germans had every reason to be proud of the courage of their troops, they greatly exaggerated the importance of this fort, because as subsequent events proved, it was not the key of Verdun. The capture of Douaumont was the climax of the first and most formidable German rush. On a front of over 20 miles, east of the Meuse, the enemy drove the French back a distance of about 4 miles, and this advance carried them nearly half-way from their original lines to Verdun. On February 26 the German progress was stayed, and although during the many weeks that the "battle" lasted, the enemy achieved various small gains of ground, there was never again anything comparable to that first great rush which overwhelmed the advanced defences of the French. In the first five days the Germans took eighty guns and 17,000 prisoners, but having regard to the stupendous scale of the operations, these captures were of quite minor importance.

The Battle of Verdun continued throughout March, April, May, and June. Early in March the British took over another large portion of the French front, thus releasing French troops to be used as reserves in the defence of Verdun. This change extended the British line as far south as the north bank of the Somme. The British line was now about 90 miles long, that is, about one quarter of the whole western front, and it extended from the north of Ypres to the Somme. In April the Germans advanced their line somewhat on the left bank of the Meuse, but here, as on the east bank, they found themselves held up by the second line of the French defence. The chief military significance of the operations around Verdun was certainly to be found in the casualties sustained. The small gain of ground had no influence on the course of the war, although if the Germans had broken the whole line of the Meuse defences, the

strategic results would doubtless have compensated them for their heavy losses. The French casualties were undoubtedly severe, especially during the initial German success and the French counter-attacks (which were almost invariably failures), but throughout the four months the Germans usually had the tactical offensive, and their losses were therefore more terrible than those of the French. Verdun accelerated the attrition of the German Army.

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE MIDDLE OF MAY TO THE FALL OF GORIZIA.

AT the end of April, when the snows melted in Russia, it came as a surprise to many people in England that there was no recrudescence of military activity on the Eastern front. Yet the first anniversary of von Mackensen's historic blow on the Duna-jec passed without incident, and throughout May neither the Russian nor the Austro-German commanders attempted to make any great move. On the Russian side there was no absence of ambitious schemes; General Alexieff, the Tsar's Chief of Staff, was silently preparing his blow but he did not propose to strike prematurely. The German General Staff, on the other hand, were deeply engaged at Verdun and had abandoned the idea of another spring offensive in Russia; moreover, the Austrians were organising an attack in another direction.

THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN OFFENSIVE FROM TYROL.

When the Italians entered the war in May, 1915, and for a whole year after that event, the Austro-Hungarian Army guarding the south-western frontier acted strictly upon the defensive. The Austrians felt secure within their mountainous and almost impregnable frontier, and only a small part of the Emperor's Army was detached to hold off the millions of his ex-ally and historic enemy. Several times in 1915 the Italians had attempted to force their way through the Austrian defences, but although the odds in men were about five to one in their favour, geography as well as the Austrian guns fought against them, and they made only the most meagre progress.

Now in the spring the Austro-Hungarian General Staff imagined that by means of deep trenches, barbed wire, and immense numbers of machine guns, they had made their lines from the Pripet to Czernovitz secure against all the power of the humiliated Muscovite. They therefore thought that the time had come to punish those whom they deemed their most traitorous foes.

The strategy of the Austrian commanders was not of a complex character. The plan was to engage the Italians along the whole frontier but to concentrate the main effort in an offensive from southern Tyrol. A glance at the map will show that a

hostile force issuing from the southern extremity of Tyrol, east of Lake Garda, would immediately threaten both Verona and Vicenza, and in so doing would render highly precarious the communications of the Italian Army on the Isonzo, 90 miles further east. This plan was the obvious one for the Austrians to adopt, so soon as they felt able to undertake an offensive of any kind, and had the expedition achieved any considerable success, it would have immediately caused the complete collapse of the Italian offensive towards Trieste. It is known that General von Hötendorf had long wished to organise an expedition against Italy.

The Austrians had held their south-western frontier during the first ten months of the Italian war with about 300,000 troops, but in March they began withdrawing men and guns, including those of the largest calibre, from the Russian front, and also from the Balkans. The army facing Italy was thus brought up to a strength of over half a million men. The main force was concentrated at and eastwards of the town of Rovereto, which the Italians had approached but had not been able to storm. The attack began on May 15, and after fighting for three days the Italians began to give ground. The Austrians first stormed the mountain Zugna Torta, an important position a few miles south of Rovereto, and close to the road from that place to Vicenza, and then advanced down the valleys of the Adige and the Brenta and over the mountainous country between those two rivers. In the first week the Austrians captured 170 guns and 24,000 prisoners. It must be remembered that although the Italians still possessed a great numerical superiority—the odds were still at least 3 to 1 in their favour—the Austrians had certain other advantages. The Austrian artillery was decidedly superior, and in proportion to the size of the army, much more numerous. Moreover, though the topographical features presented great difficulties even to the Austrians, these were less formidable than those encountered by the Italians fighting in the opposite direction.

Within a few days the Austrians crossed the frontier, and for the first time in the war carried the operations into Italian territory. The Italian Government quickly appreciated the seriousness of the situation, and on May 25 it was announced that General Roberto Brusati, who had been in command of the Italian Army of Tyrol, had been removed from his post. General Cadorna, the Commander-in-Chief of all the Italian Armies, was not dismissed, however, and within a few weeks fortune gave him an easy opportunity of retrieving a mistake for which it was said he was partly responsible. The victorious Austrians pushed on, and although their advance over such difficult country was necessarily slow, owing to the superior quality of their guns and to their superiority, at least locally, in generalship, they were able to overcome all the attempts of the Italian soldiery to maintain their ground.

The advance was most rapid in the Austrian centre, in the neighbourhood of the small river Astico. On this section of the front the Austrians advanced 12 miles in a fortnight, and penetrated 10 miles into Italian territory. In the valley of the Adige, known as the Val Lagarina, the Italians held their ground better, and along this line of advance the Austrians never crossed the frontier. Further east, along the valley of the Brenta, called the Val Sugana, the enemy made considerable progress, however, and recaptured the large Austrian town of Borgo. In the second week of the offensive the Austrians captured another 130 guns, but for the most part the defeated Italians were able to avoid capture, and only 6,000 more prisoners fell into the hands of the Emperor's troops. On June 1 the Austrian authorities announced that the important Italian towns, Arsiero and Asiago, had fallen, and there was great rejoicing in Vienna. Arsiero is 10 miles within the Italian frontier, and lies about midway between Trent and Vicenza. The position now looked very black for the Italians. The advanced lines of the Austrian Army, south of Arsiero, were within 6 miles of the plain of Venetia, and the capture of Arsiero had itself been a moral as well as a strategic victory, for the town had been very strongly defended. Moreover, the capture of Asiago was also of the first importance, because it brought the Austrians within striking distance of Vastagna, the fall of which would turn the whole position on the Brenta and lead to a disastrous retreat of the Italian Army in the Val Sugana. Similarly, the progress of the Austrian line west of Arsiero threatened to turn the Italian position on the Adige by the capture of the Covi Zugna, one of the main defences of the Val Lagarina. Thus at the beginning of June there appeared to be a serious possibility that the armies of an Austrian Emperor would once more appear before the gates of Verona and Vicenza.

But the Great War, divided though it was between many theatres, was yet in some respects one campaign, and help for the Italians was at hand. Just at the moment when the Austrians were about to issue into the sunny plains of Venetia, Brussiloff, the great Russian general, struck a terrific blow at the Austro-Hungarian lines near Luck. Von Hötzendorf had made a fatal miscalculation. His lines in the east had been too thinly held, and they crumbled to pieces under the bombardment of Russia's new guns. Luck, Dubno, Kovel, Czernovitz, even Lemberg were immediately in peril, and from all quarters the Dual Monarchy began to recall troops to replace the thousands of prisoners who were falling into the hands of the Tsar's soldiers. Thus was the offensive from Tyrol paralysed. The Italians delivered a counter-blow, and the diminished Austrian Army beat a hasty though orderly retreat, and Arsiero and Asiago were once more occupied by Italian troops.

THE GREAT RUSSIAN OFFENSIVE IN JUNE.

The greatest movements of the year occurred in the Eastern Theatre, and in some respects these were the most important military events of the whole summer. The territorial gains achieved by the Russians were enormously greater than any which were made on the Western Front by the Franco-British Armies. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that although the Western Allies in their offensive in July failed to break the enemy's line, yet the Western Theatre was of pre-eminent importance in the sense that during this summer, as throughout the whole previous history of the war, the larger part of the German Army was stationed there. The deadlock in France and Flanders tended to mask the importance of that sphere of operations, and made it of less engrossing interest to the onlookers, but nevertheless it was there, and not in Russia, that the most powerful armies were in conflict with one another.

The Tsar was nominally the Commander-in-Chief of the Russian Army, but executive power was really vested in his Chief of Staff, General Alexieff. This commander was determined not to strike before his supply of munitions, the dearth of which had been so fatal to the Russian Army in the previous year, was really sufficient. For weeks after the snows had melted, the Russians attempted no movement. But the imminent danger of a great Italian collapse at the beginning of June caused the Russians to strike at that moment, though apparently not more than a few weeks earlier than had been intended by the Muscovite General Staff. As explained in Chapter I., Russia's main front was really divided by the Pripet Marshes into what constituted almost independent spheres of operations, north and south respectively of those huge swamps. In the southern area, from the Pripet Marshes to the Rumanian frontier, General Brussiloff was in command, and it was to this general that the chief honours of the whole summer's campaigning must be given. He was faced by forces which were partly German and partly Austro-Hungarian, but in this region the German soldiers were a small minority. Thus there existed several reasons for selecting this part of the front for the first blow; it was the section of the enemy's front which, being mainly Austro-Hungarian, was presumably the weakest section, and it was also clear that a success achieved against Austria herself would necessarily have the most immediate effect on the perilous situation in North-eastern Italy.

The first news of the great Russian move came from Vienna, through the official communiqué issued on June 4. It was stated that the entire Austro-Hungarian front was being subjected to a terrific bombardment, and that the firing was especially severe on the Dniester and the Lower Styrpa. The Austrian lines on the Dniester, 20 miles north of Czernovitz,

were completely wrecked, and it was here that the worst collapse took place. Another immense breach in the Austrian line was made further to the north-west, east of Luck, and the first, though ultimately not the most important, Russian advance was made in the neighbourhood of that great fortress. General Brussiloff's main object was to carry out a great advance upon Kovel, which was an important railway junction. The railway running from Brest-Litovsk to Kovel and thence bifurcating to Rovno and Vladimir Volynsk, was important as affording a direct means of communication between the Austro-German Armies north and south respectively of the Pripet Marshes. The other object was to seize Czernovitz and the eastern passes of the Carpathians and thus to threaten once more, as in the early days of the war, the great plain of Hungary.

At first the advance on Kovel met with great success. The infantry attacks began on June 4, and on the first day 13,000 prisoners were captured and in the next two days another 12,000 were taken, and also 27 guns. Eastward of Luck the whole Russian line was now on the move, and so completely had the Austro-Hungarian entrenchments been destroyed that the Russians were able to use cavalry on a large scale. The unexpected success of the Russian blow had a most demoralising effect on the Austrians. Pursued by the Russian horsemen, they were rounded up in masses, and surrendered in thousands. On June 7, 50 more guns and 26,000 more prisoners were taken by the victors. General Brussiloff sent a telegram to his Emperor recording the triumph. On June 6 the advanced guards entered Luck, and the following day the town was occupied in force, and the Russians passed through rapidly and continued their march westward. Luck, it will be remembered, was captured by the Austrians in September, 1915. Dubno was also recaptured from the enemy. In four days the Russians advanced no less than 30 miles along the great main road to Vladimir Volynsk and were then not much over that distance from the town.

On June 8 a further batch of prisoners, not less than 20,000 men, was captured, but at this point assistance arrived from the German Army of the north. The German Staff quickly realised the peril of their allies, and reinforcements were found by withdrawing men from Von Hindenburg's and Prince Leopold of Bavaria's armies on the north of the Pripet Marshes. The German troops were rushed southwards to Kovel and then along the Rovno Railway as far as the River Styr, where the great battle was fought. The arrival of the German troops effectively rallied the fleeing Austrians.

Thus the advance against the left wing of the Austro-Hungarian Army was checked. The Austrian centre, which was situated about Brody and was commanded by the Bavarian general, Count von Bothmer, had successfully held its ground from the beginning. On the Austrian right wing, however,

there was a veritable debacle. General Brussiloff's troops, here commanded by General Letchitsky, broke all the Austrian defences on the Dniester, and on June 9 and 10 nearly 20,000 prisoners were captured in this region alone. The Austrians fled, and within a few days the Russian guns were once more bombarding Czernovitz. Between the Dniester and the Pruth there was no halt, and hordes of cavalry pursued and harried the defeated enemy.

Immense quantities of booty of all sorts fell into the hands of the Russians. Barbed-wire, rifle-ammunition, hand-grenades, coal, and supplies of all kinds were captured. For the most part, however, the Austrians succeeded in saving their guns, the number of cannons taken not being large, judged by modern standards. Thus during the first week of the offensive, June 4-10 inclusive, the total number of prisoners recorded was 107,000, but the Austrians only lost 125 guns in this period, a number which is disproportionately small, and suggests that the commanders intentionally sacrificed their infantry rather than their armament. The fighting was very severe in Galicia, as well as in Bukovina and Volhynia, but here, as already stated, the Russian progress was much less marked. On June 10, however, the Russians captured the important town of Buczacz, which is situated on the banks of the Styrpa.

During the second week of the offensive, June 11-17, the Russians continued to pour through the two great breaches in the Austrian line, but in the Austrian centre Count von Bothmer stood firm in front of Brody. The Russians threw their troops in masses against this general's army, but they were repulsed with heavy losses. The Russians reached a point within 25 miles of Kovel, but here, on the banks of the Stokhod, their advance was definitely stopped. The southern advance had far greater success. For several days the Austrians—or rather, the Hungarians, for the troops at this point were mostly Magyars—defended the outskirts of Czernovitz with desperation, but on June 17 the Tsar's troops forced the passage of the Pruth and once more entered the capital of Bukovina. This was the third time since the beginning of the war that the Russians had captured Czernovitz. During the second week of this "battle" the Russians took 60,000 prisoners and captured 50 more guns.

The Austro-Hungarian retreat from Czernovitz was very rapid. During the last few days the passage of the Pruth was contested by a rearguard only, and these troops fought with such success that the main army, under the command of General von Pflanzer, was able to escape from the city without further losses in prisoners or guns. The Austrians did not attempt to make another stand until they reached the eastern slopes of the Carpathians. Thus the Russians advanced by forced marches for about 40 miles south of Czernovitz, and in a few days the Muscovites had once more occupied almost the whole of Bukovina. Reaching the barrier of the Carpathians, the Russian

flood was diverted, and began to sweep westwards parallel with the mountain ranges. General Lietchitsky's next objective was the important town and railway junction of Kolomea, which lies some 50 miles west of Czernovitz, on the main railway line to Lemberg. The Russians hoped that by this movement they would not only gain territory, but would be able to out-flank von Bothmer on his right wing, and thus compel that stubborn general to fall back on Lemberg. This advance in the south continued to progress, but it should be observed that it never had the strategic importance of the furious assault aimed at Kovel. It was eastwards of Kovel that the chief danger to the Austrians lay, and it was there that they received the greatest assistance from their powerful allies. Large reinforcements were sent to von Linsingen, who was in command on the Stokhod, and during the third week, June 18-24, that famous general not only held his own, but actually recovered a small portion of the territory that had been lost to the Russians.

Meanwhile, the Russians were not idle further north. A great offensive was launched against the German lines north of the Pripet, and the Russians charged the German lines in dense masses. One of the most determined assaults took place in the neighbourhood of Baranoviche, and the Russians also took the offensive still further north, where the veteran general, Kuropatkin, was in command. These attacks failed, and their main result was to cause the Russians the very heavy casualties which are inseparable from an offensive, especially an unsuccessful offensive, under modern conditions.

The effects of von Linsingen's reinforcements in the north and the valorous stand by the Austro-Hungarian rearguard in front of Czernovitz in the south are apparent in the small number of prisoners taken by the Russians in the third week, as compared with the many thousands captured in the first two weeks. In the third week of the offensive the Russians captured only 12,000 prisoners, and very few guns. It should be stated here that the Austro-Hungarian General Staff gave out that the Russian statements regarding the number of prisoners captured (which we have accepted as accurate in the *ANNUAL REGISTER*) were gross exaggerations, and claimed that the number of soldiers thus lost was much smaller. Having regard to the magnitude of the operations, there is, however, no intrinsic improbability in the Russian claims, but rather the reverse, and there is therefore no good reason for doubting the official figures published in Petrograd.

The course of the battle during the fourth week of the offensive (the last week in June) was similar to that of the third. Brussiloff advanced rapidly on his left wing but failed to gain any ground on his right. The right wing of Brussiloff's great army was commanded by General Kaledin, whose duty it was, as already stated, to take Kovel. In the fourth week, however, Kaledin was reduced to the defensive by von Linsingen. The

latter hammered on the right side of the huge Russian salient, in the neighbourhood of Sokul, on the Styr, and although he in his turn only succeeded in gaining about 4 miles of ground, and never came near to retaking Luck, he was able before the end of June definitely to defeat Kaledin's assault upon Kovel.

In the south the Russians, after capturing the whole of Bukovina, marched west into Galicia, and so rapid was General Letchitsky's advance that he arrived within artillery range of Kolomea on June 26. At this point the Austrians had rallied, and they attempted to defend the town. But General Letchitsky once again proved his superiority. The new Austrian lines were severely bombarded, and after three days' desperate fighting the enemy's defences again cracked and the Russian infantry poured through the gap. Nearly 11,000 prisoners were captured in front of Kolomea, and on the last day of June General Letchitsky entered that town.

At this point the centre of interest shifted once more to the Western Theatre, and during July and August the strategic changes in the East were of a much less important character. Yet General Brussiloff's moves retained their paramount interest. The error of judgment made by the Austro-German command in weakening their lines south of the Pripet in order to obtain the troops necessary for the expedition into Venetia influenced the whole course of the summer's campaign to the detriment of the Central Powers. It was from that one mistake that all the successes of the Entente flowed. General Brussiloff's army from the Pripet to Rumania numbered in all 1,500,000 men. During June that General captured approximately 210,000 men from the Austro-German forces opposing him, and also took about 230 guns. The total Austro-Hungarian and German casualties on this front are not known exactly, but the number killed and wounded during June cannot have been much under 150,000. The total of the Austro-Hungarian forces originally opposed to Brussiloff at the beginning of his offensive was about 750,000 men, so that the odds were roughly 2 to 1, and about half the enemy's army on this front was put out of action in this one month, an achievement of which the Russian Staff might justly feel proud. The Austro-German forces captured very few prisoners during this period, the only appreciable number being about 11,000 men taken by von Linsingen when he drove in Kaledin's front near Sokul. The Russian casualties south of the Pripet were undoubtedly less than half as numerous as those of their enemies.

Thus was a heavy blow struck at the Austro-German position in the East. The reverse side of the picture is to be found in the fighting in the northern sphere of operations, the lines from Riga to the Pripet. There also the Russians attempted to make an advance on a large scale, but there they completely failed. In this region the Russian casualties were much heavier than those of the Germans, who were acting strictly on the de-

fensive. Nevertheless, in the Eastern Theatre as a whole, the advantage was with Russia.

THE WAR AT SEA.

It has been remarked that the attention of the general public not only in France, Russia, and Italy, but even in Great Britain, had throughout the war been concentrated upon the military operations in Europe, to the almost complete exclusion of the war at sea. The reason for this was not of course that the naval side of the war was unimportant; quite the contrary. The true reason was not far to seek. The command of the land, though it had obviously inclined in one direction all through the war, was always in dispute, and the situation on land was therefore incessantly and critically interesting. The command of the sea, on the other hand, had never been in doubt, and had never been seriously in dispute. There were therefore no dramatic events to attract the attention of the onlooker.

Yet although on the sea there was this absence of incident, this lack of portentous episodes, the naval war was proceeding silently and unceasingly in a manner that threatened to produce some of the most terrible of all the results of the war. If the sea was often forgotten in France and England, it was not forgotten in Germany. For half a continent was in danger of strangulation, in peril of losing the breath of its life. The economic pressure upon Central Europe which had been exerted by the British naval blockade throughout the first thirty months of the war had produced very serious results, and had caused effects without which the outlook for the Entente would have been completely hopeless. Indeed, it is not too much to say that in its essence the conflict became a few months after its outbreak, and thereafter remained, a war between the German Army and the British Navy.

The British fleet was ever at work striving to prevent the German Army receiving the raw materials which were the sustenance of its death-dealing powers, and striving to crush through famine the spirit of the nation out of whose being the army had sprung. The German Army was as constantly endeavouring to conquer for itself the materials necessary for its existence, and hoped through its victories to render itself independent of the heavy handicap under which it laboured owing to the German Empire's impotence at sea. But whereas the German Army was always obliged to face the active opposition of other armies, the British Navy rarely had to deal with the activities of the hostile fleets, save in the minor form of mines and submarines. The British supremacy was so great, that seriously to challenge it would have been little different from suicide on the part of the challenger. There were controversies in Germany as to whether Russia or Great Britain was the country with which it was impossible for Germany to hope for

anything but enmity, the country which was politically the most inevitably antagonistic to Central Europe; but there could be no controversy as to which of the two Powers was strategically the most formidable opponent of Germany, for that was self-evident. The war no doubt originated, politically, as primarily a conflict between Russia and Central Europe, but as time went on it assumed the character, strategically, of a contest in which Germany and Great Britain were the chief combatants. The course of the war made clear, what had been doubtful before, the fact that Germany and Great Britain were beyond all possibility of dispute the two greatest Powers in Europe.

And if the ability to perform the task which the armed forces of a country are expected to have to undertake be the criterion of preparedness and efficiency, then it must be conceded that in successful preparedness for war Great Britain had excelled even Germany. Successful as the German Army had been, its triumphs could not compare with the story of the undisputed dominance which has to be told of the British fleet. In the strategy of the Entente, as pre-arranged, the British fleet was expected to hold the seas and the armies of France and Russia were expected to prove more than a match for those of the Triple Alliance, but it was anticipated by nobody that there would be any serious contest at sea. Similarly, in the strategy of the old Triple Alliance, it was hoped that the united armies would be superior to the Franco-Russian forces and that the German fleet would at least gravely imperil the maritime communications of Great Britain. The German Army proved wonderfully successful; in spite of the defection and eventual hostility of one of its allies, and despite the disastrous breakdown of the other ally in the first six weeks, it showed itself more than a match for the Franco-Russian forces, even with the army of Italy and several millions of improvised British troops to help them. But against this success of the German Army in accomplishing even more than was expected of it, must be set the failure of the German fleet to play even that not very great part which Germans might legitimately have expected of it. On land Germany was bolstering up her weak and for the most part incompetent allies. Both at sea and on land, the British were the main strength of the opposing alliance, and were not only completely successful in their own part of the strategic scheme, but were through their new armies saving from disaster the other members of the alliance, who, not from any lack of goodwill but from their inferior efficiency, had been unable to carry through the part which the strategic scheme, as pre-arranged, had assigned to them. The political issues apart, the great war presented, on its two sides, a marvellous spectacle of the pre-eminent competence, energy and valour of Germany and England.

Throughout the earlier part of the year under consideration the only events which occurred in the maritime war, aside from

the perpetual stress of the blockade, were a number of quite minor and unimportant incidents. Thus on March 25 a number of British cruisers, torpedo-boat destroyers and seaplanes raided the coast of Schleswig, the seaplanes bombing some German airship sheds. In this affair H.M.S. *Medusa* (a small cruiser) was sunk, but all her crew, in spite of the heavy weather, were saved by the destroyer *Lassoc* (Lieut.-Commander V. S. Butler). A German destroyer was rammed and sunk by H.M.S. *Cleopatra* and several German patrol-boats were also sunk. It appears that the cause of the mishap to the *Medusa* was that she had been in collision with the destroyer *Laverock*.

A month later, on April 25, the Germans in their turn raided the English coast. The enemy's battle-cruiser squadron, which consisted of very fast vessels, once more rushed across the North Sea under cover of darkness and bombarded Lowestoft and the neighbouring coast of Suffolk. The local naval force, consisting of much smaller vessels, engaged the raiders for twenty minutes, two British light cruisers and one destroyer being hit by shells, but none being sunk. After doing this damage the Germans made for their home ports, and escaped before any more powerful British ships could reach the scene. This bombardment of Lowestoft took place at about 4.30 a.m. on April 25.

Of a different character was the achievement of the German disguised cruiser *Möwe*, which slipped out of the North Sea, and raided the Atlantic Ocean in January and February and successfully returned to Germany at the beginning of March. Being disguised this vessel was able to pass through the British cordon across the North Sea from Scotland to Norway. The following British steamers were either sunk or sent as prizes into neutral ports by the *Möwe*: the *Corbridge*, *Author*, *Trader*, *Ariadne*, *Dromonby*, *Farringford*, *Clan Mactavish*, *Appam*, *Westburn*, *Horace*, *Flamenco*, and *Saxon Prince*. In addition a British sailing ship and a couple of foreign steamers were sunk, and the *Möwe* took back to Germany 50,000*l.* in gold bars which she had seized.

The German submarines caused very appreciable losses to the British mercantile fleet, perhaps the most serious blow of this character in the earlier part of the year being the torpedoing of the great White Star liner *Cymric* off the coast of Ireland during the night of May 8-9. The ship was carrying a general cargo and was on a voyage home from New York. Five of the crew were killed by the explosion, but all the rest escaped in the boats, as the vessel did not sink until nearly eleven hours after being struck, and the crew were subsequently picked up and landed by a Dutch vessel.

These episodes were, of course, of quite minor importance, but at the end of May a really great naval battle at last took place. The previous naval engagements, even the most serious of them—the Dogger Bank, Coronel, the Falkland Islands—

had been between relatively small and isolated fragments of the rival navies, but on May 31 a great battle was fought in the North Sea, off the coast of Jutland, in which the main German fleet and the main British fleet took part. This was in every sense the greatest naval battle since Trafalgar, and in so far as the power of warships had increased in the previous century out of all recognition, it was much the most terrible sea-fight in all history.

The stress of the British blockade had come to be severely felt in Germany during the spring and summer, and under these circumstances it became imperative for the Emperor's Government to make some attempt to relieve the pressure, even though such an attempt involved the grave risks of disaster which were inseparable from a challenge by the inferior German fleet to the immense and superior British navy. The British fleet, under Admiral Sir John Jellicoe, had long been desirous of striking a blow at the main forces of the enemy. But having regard to the greatly superior strength of the British Navy, it was not the object of Admiral von Scheer, who was in command of the German High Seas Fleet, to seek a direct general engagement between the entire forces of the two navies. The German admiral's object, when at last he issued forth from his ports, was to attempt to take the British fleet in detail, and if possible to destroy a portion of that fleet, and then retreat again to the protection of the German coasts without giving battle to the main mass of the British forces. It was obvious that if this strategy could be repeated, with success, on several occasions, it would then become possible for the German fleet to make a serious bid for the command of the sea by challenging the thus truncated British fleet; but it need not be supposed that the German Admiralty entertained the illusion that their chance of accomplishing this aim in the manner stated was anything but very small. They were no doubt well aware that their chances of success were remote and that the risks which they were running were very grave, but the general situation in the naval and economic side of the war had become such that the Imperial Admiralty were obliged to take these great risks.

On May 31 the entire German High Seas Fleet left port and steamed up the west coast of Denmark, engaged, as the German Government phrased it, "on an enterprise directed towards the north." The fleet consisted of "Dreadnought" battleships, battle-cruisers, older battleships, and a swarm of smaller craft—cruisers, torpedo-boats, and submarines, and was also accompanied by air-ships. The German fleet was quickly sighted by the British scouts, and the main British fleet immediately steamed out from its base to engage the enemy. The British battle-cruiser squadron, under the command of Admiral Sir David Beatty, was nearer the scene than the main battle-fleet under Sir John Jellicoe himself, and was also of course much faster, and hence it came up with the Germans long before

the heavy "Dreadnought" battleships of the main squadron arrived.

Sir David Beatty sighted the corresponding squadron of the German fleet—that is, the battle-cruiser squadron—north-west of the Horn Reef, between the Horn Reef¹ and the Skager Rak, and about 3.30 in the afternoon the ships engaged. The odds were slightly in favour of the British during the preliminary stage of the encounter. Sir D. Beatty had six large vessels under his immediate command, namely, the battle-cruisers *Queen Mary*, *Lion*, *Tiger*, *Princess Royal*, *Indefatigable*, and *New Zealand*, besides smaller cruisers and torpedo-craft, whereas the commander of the German battle-cruiser squadron, Admiral von Hipper, had five battle-cruisers, accompanied, of course, by smaller warships. The battle opened badly, however, for the British, for within a few minutes of the commencement of the engagement between the two advanced squadrons both the *Queen Mary* and the *Indefatigable* were sunk. The fighting began at a range of about 18,500 yards. In spite of this weakening of the British squadron, von Hipper retreated eastwards towards Admiral von Scheer's main fleet, closely followed by Beatty. The British battle-cruiser squadron was supported by a squadron of four fast battleships, some of the newest and most powerful vessels in the Royal Navy, under the command of Rear-Admiral Evan-Thomas. These four battleships were the *Warspite*, *Valiant*, *Barham*, and *Malaya*. Evan-Thomas's squadron was somewhat behind the battle-cruiser squadron, but it came into action soon after four o'clock. It appears that when it became known that the German fleet had at last ventured to come out into the open sea, the somewhat scattered squadrons of the Grand Fleet raced towards the enemy, and hence arrived upon the scene in succession, in separate detachments. Sir David Beatty's object was to get between von Scheer and his base, and thus compel him to fight a general action with Sir John Jellicoe. This manœuvre gave the German Admiral the opportunity for which he was looking, that of dealing with a small detachment of the British fleet, a fact which was not lost upon Sir David Beatty, who knowingly took risks in order to force a general engagement. The *Queen Mary* was one of the most powerful and most recent of the battle-cruisers, being a vessel of 27,500 tons and having been launched in 1912. The *Indefatigable* was a smaller ship, of 18,750 tons, and was completed in 1911. Curiously enough the loss of these two ships occurred, not when the British were fighting extremely heavy odds, as they subsequently were, but when the odds were somewhat in their favour. It was reported that in each case a shell struck the ship's magazine and thus caused a very violent explosion.

At about five o'clock Admiral Beatty, with his four remaining battle-cruisers and the four fast battleships (which, by the

¹ The battle is variously known as the "Battle of Jutland" or the "Battle of Horn Reef."

way, were sister-ships to the *Queen Elizabeth*, famous for her actions off the Dardanelles), sighted the main German fleet; and Beatty immediately lined up, and gave battle to the entire fleet, steaming a parallel course to the Germans. This daring action was in keeping with the most dashing traditions of the British Navy, and it is strange to have to relate that in this unequal contest—there were about thirty German battleships present—which, moreover, lasted for an hour, none of the eight British capital ships was sunk, though the *Warspite* appears to have been badly damaged. The four fast battleships were extremely powerful ships, armed with 15-inch guns, and this no doubt compensated in some degree for the small number of British units present.

At about 6.15 Rear-Admiral Hood, commanding a smaller squadron of battle-cruisers, consisting of the *Invincible*, *Inflexible*, and *Indomitable* hove in sight and entered the fray. Admiral Hood was not far in advance of the main battle-fleet, with which his cruiser-squadron had been stationed. Hood fell into line with Beatty, but within a few minutes the *Invincible* sank with the famous admiral on board. The *Invincible* was one of the earliest of the "Dreadnought" cruisers, and was a vessel of only 17,250 tons. She took part in the action in the Heligoland Bight on August 28, 1914, and also in the battle off the Falkland Islands on December 8, 1914. Very shortly after the loss of the *Invincible* the main British fleet came into action, but during the junction between the battle-fleet on the one hand and the now united cruiser-squadrons and the four fast battleships on the other hand, the British battleships had to exercise the greatest care in order not to mistake, at long range, British for German ships.

The action between the two main fleets lasted about two hours, until nearly 8.30, and was fought at ranges varying from 9,000 to 12,000 yards. Very few ships were sunk on either side during this part of the engagement, but important vessels on both sides were severely damaged. The evening was misty, and this undoubtedly prevented the battle being fought out to a more definite issue. As night fell, Admiral von Scheer retreated to the south-east, and left the British in possession of the scene of action. Throughout the night, however, the retreating Germans were harried by the British light cruisers and destroyers. During this latest part of the battle a German battleship was torpedoed and sunk.

In regard to the losses incurred by the rival fleets it is impossible at the time of writing to arrive at the whole truth, for there were serious discrepancies between the stories told by the German and British witnesses respectively. So far as the statements made by the German Admiralty are concerned, they were discredited in a manner which was little short of ludicrous. After solemnly declaring that the first German account was a true report of the German losses, the Imperial Admiralty had to

admit a week later that their first account was deliberately fallacious, and that the sinking of the great battle-cruiser *Lützow* had been concealed for (as they expressed it) "military reasons." The statements of the British Admiralty in regard to the British losses in ships sunk may be accepted, but little information was vouchsafed concerning the ships which were badly damaged without being actually sunk. On the other hand, even the official British account of the German losses was admittedly based in part upon surmise. Witnesses in a naval battle see that a hostile ship is seriously damaged, and whilst passing out of sight they assume that the ship in question is about to sink, without actually witnessing that occurrence. This is known and admitted to have occurred in a much smaller naval battle which took place later in the English Channel, the British Admiralty giving out a statement of German losses, which they afterwards confessed was based upon guess-work only.

When the British and German accounts of the losses are closely examined, with due allowance for the conditions prevailing in such a conflict as this, it is seen that most, though not all, the discrepancies are apparent rather than real; and it is possible, though far from certain, that the only deliberate lie told by the German Admiralty was that to which they subsequently confessed.

Taking the German losses first, the British stated that they blew up a "Dreadnought" battleship in the fighting at night. The Germans admitted the loss of a battleship, but not a "Dreadnought," the vessel in question being the *Pommern*, built in 1907. The British account did not claim that any pre-Dreadnought battleship had been sunk, so that the German loss in battleships may be taken as one vessel actually sunk, which may or may not have been a "Dreadnought." The British account further stated that another "Dreadnought" battleship was seriously damaged and was "believed to have been sunk by gunfire." The Germans admitted that their main fleet was damaged, but only admitted, as already stated, that one battleship was actually sunk.

The German battle-cruiser *Lützow* was sunk in the early phase of the battle, soon after the *Queen Mary* and the *Indefatigable*. This loss was not recorded in the first German account, but as already stated, it was subsequently admitted. The *Lützow* was a new ship of 28,000 tons. Apparently she was severely damaged and dropped out of the line of battle, and sank in endeavouring to make her way to a home port. The British account also stated that another great battle-cruiser was seen to be "disabled and stopping," but she was not seen to sink, and the German story that only one of the enemy's battle-cruisers was sunk may therefore be correct.

In respect of smaller ships, the Germans lost the four small cruisers *Wiesbaden*, *Frauenlob*, *Elbing*, and *Rostock*, and they also lost, according to their own version, five torpedo-boats.

On the British side, three battle-cruisers were sunk, as already described. Oddly enough the German account of the British losses did not claim that the *Invincible* was sunk, but did claim that the *Warspite* was sunk. The *Warspite* was damaged, and it is an interesting problem in the study of evidence whether the Germans mistook the *Invincible* for the *Warspite* or whether they were quite ignorant of the fate of the *Invincible*, and seeing the *Warspite* drop out of the line, assumed that she was sinking. The British also lost three smaller cruisers, the *Defence* (14,600 tons), the *Black Prince* (13,500 tons), and the *Warrior* (13,550 tons), and eight destroyers.

If we ascribe to the German statements more credibility than is probably justified, the respective losses of the two fleets may be tabled as follows:—

	British.	German.
"Dreadnought" Battleships - - - -	None	None
"Dreadnought" Battle-cruisers - - - -	3	1
Pre-Dreadnought Battleships - - - -	None	1
Armoured Cruisers - - - -	3	None
Light Cruisers - - - -	None	4
Destroyers - - - -	8	5
Submarines - - - -	None	1?

The losses in ships actually sunk were on this assumption heavier on the side of the British than on that of the Germans, but it was believed in England that a greater number of German ships were seriously damaged without being actually sunk, though of course some of the British ships which survived were likewise damaged.

Having regard to the size of the fleets engaged, the losses were small, and the battle was of an inconclusive character, neither side being able to claim anything in the nature of a final victory. In so far, however, as the German fleet was driven back to port with wounds not less severe than those which it inflicted upon the detached portion of the British fleet with which it first came in contact, the advantage rested with the British. The British navy still ruled the seas, and though it was true that Admiral von Scheer never hoped to wrest the command of the seas from the British in one blow, he was so little satisfied with the result of his attempt to begin destroying the British fleet in detail, that up till the end of the year under consideration he never issued forth again on the same errand. The British strategy gave the German admiral the very opportunity which he sought, that of meeting an inferior squadron, but the result, if not entirely satisfactory to the British, was not such as the Germans hoped to achieve. The German fleet was reported to have been well served by its Zeppelin air-ships, which acting as scouts, gave von Scheer timely warning of the approach of the main British fleet. In spite of his initial losses great credit was due to Admiral Beatty for the manner in which he engaged, without being destroyed, a far superior enemy. On the German side, the seamanship of von Hipper was to be admired, and it was he rather than von Scheer who inflicted the most serious losses on the British.

It is gratifying to be able to record that the official reports of each nation paid generous tribute to the heroic bravery with which the opposing side fought the battle.

In July the British Government made important emendations in the rules according to which they were enforcing a blockade of Central Europe, and this was effected in a drastic manner by formally withdrawing the Declaration of London by means of an Order in Council of July 8 date. It will be remembered that Great Britain had not been bound in International Law by the Declaration of London, that declaration never having been ratified by Parliament, but in spite of this the Government had announced on August 20, 1914, that they proposed to abide by the rules of the declaration, subject to certain minor modifications. The present Order in Council, which was to be known as "the Maritime Rights Order in Council, 1916," after withdrawing the Declaration of London, laid down certain new regulations for maritime warfare, as follows: (1) In respect of the "hostile destination" which was required to be shown for the condemnation of contraband goods, this should be presumed to exist, until the contrary could be shown, when the goods were consigned to "a person who, during the present hostilities, has forwarded contraband goods to an enemy authority, or an agent of an enemy state, or to or for a person in territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy, or if the goods are consigned to order, or if the ship's papers do not show who is the real consignee of the goods," in addition of course to the obvious cases in which the goods were consigned direct to the enemy. (2) "The principle of continuous voyage or ultimate destination shall be applicable both in cases of contraband and of blockade." (3) "A neutral vessel carrying contraband with papers indicating a neutral destination, which, notwithstanding the destination shown on the papers, proceeds to an enemy port, shall be liable to capture and condemnation if she is encountered before the end of her next voyage." (4) A vessel carrying contraband shall be liable to capture and condemnation if the contraband reckoned either by value, weight, volume, or freight, forms more than half the cargo.

THE FRANCO-BRITISH OFFENSIVE IN JULY.

After a long period of comparative quiescence, except for the defence of Verdun, the Franco-British Army on the Western Front commenced a furious offensive at the beginning of July. This was the renewed attempt to break through the German line on a really large scale which had been expected for months by the whole world. The project was a daring one. Since the lines had become fixed after Sir John French's failure to relieve Antwerp in the autumn of 1914, every great offensive on the Western Front, by whichever side it had been made, had failed in a disastrous manner for the assaulting army. The deadlock was more complete in the main Western theatre than in any

other sphere of operations. The German rush at the first battle of Ypres, the great French assault in Champagne, the prolonged, determined, and skilful German offensive before Verdun, all these had collapsed before the immense strength, the huge advantage, which modern military science gives to an army on the defensive.

It was a matter of common knowledge that there were among the Allies strategists who held that it was a mistake to attempt a great offensive on the Western Front, and that it was advisable to seek a decision in an altogether different direction. These authorities thought that the chances of success were too small to warrant such a hazardous undertaking, and they attached weight to the consideration that the loss of life would be terrible in the event of failure, and, indeed, even in the event of success. However, this was not the view taken by the responsible military chiefs in France and Great Britain, and in favour of the course actually adopted, it was pointed out that if the difficulties were greater on the Western Front, that front was also the area wherein, for obvious geographical reasons, both France and Great Britain were able to exert their greatest force.

The offensive when at last it came was mainly a British movement. The French co-operated, but they were allotted a minor part. This was somewhat disguised by the fact that, as will be seen, the French achieved appreciable successes; but the reason they won these advantages was not that their blow was more forceful than, or as forceful as, that of the British, but that the Germans feared the British more and had concentrated a much more formidable army in front of the British line. In fact, the first French assault, which gained ground, took the enemy somewhat by surprise. The position was therefore the reverse of what it had been in the previous September, when much the more important operations had been allotted to the French troops.

The section of the line chosen by the Franco-British commanders for the new offensive began several miles south of Arras, but north of the river Ancre, and extended to several miles south of the Somme. Between Arras and the Somme the line was held by British troops, but south of the Somme the operations were carried out by the French. It is necessary for the reader to envisage the nature and scale of the great movement which was being attempted. The German line ran westwards of the small town of Combles, and at this spot the enemy's line penetrated deeper than at almost any other point into French territory. The German front lines were over forty miles in advance of the Belgian frontier. Now the object of the offensive, in its first stage, was to smash the German front lines, drive the enemy back into the Ardennes about Maubeuge, thus reconquering the greater part of that important industrial district of France which had been lost since the beginning of the war, and threaten the enemy's position near Lille and in the north-west corner of

Belgium by causing it to become a dangerous salient. An advance of this character would also have compelled a rectification of the German line further south, and therefore, of course, have effected the delivery of more French soil from the invaders.

The actual distances involved in this project were not by any means a serious consideration. Much greater distances, often over very difficult country, had been traversed in the space of a few days or weeks by armies in the other theatres. The difficulty lay in the immense strength and depth of the German fortified lines. The distance from the British line to Cambrai, notable as the place where the British halted and made a stand in the retreat from Mons to the Marne, was about twenty miles. The distance to Mons itself (within the Belgian frontier of course) was about fifty miles. Thus the first stage in a great offensive undertaken from this point with the ultimate object of driving the Germans back to the Rhine involved an advance of about forty miles. It is true that even with this stage accomplished the Germans would have remained entrenched in the Ardennes, would still have held a portion of the French territory further south, and would still have retained nearly all the Belgian flat lands in their grip; but notwithstanding this, a highly important district of France would have been recovered, and in a break of this magnitude the Germans might well have lost two or three hundred thousand men in prisoners alone. The distance from the point where the British offensive opened to the German frontier, near Aachen, is about 160 miles in a straight line.

After the terrific bombardment, which had become the usual preliminary effort in an offensive, and which in this case lasted several days, the French and British infantry moved to the assault on July 1. It will be remembered that the British line ran about two miles east of Arras and about five miles east of Albert. Between these two towns the line bent somewhat westwards, so that the British line here made a concavity looking towards Germany. The northern extremity, or left wing, of the offensive was situate eight or nine miles north of the Ancre, in the neighbourhood of a village named Gommecourt; and the southern extremity was near the village of Fay, about an equal distance south of the Somme. The line thus fell naturally into three sections: (1) the position north of the Ancre, which was British, (2) the section between the Ancre and the Somme, which was also almost wholly British and was the scene of the most severe fighting, and (3) the section south of the Somme which was French.

The assault along the whole of this selected part of the line was launched at 7.30 a.m. on July 1. South of the Somme the French were fortunate in finding the Germans relatively unprepared, the enemy having deemed the French army incapable of any really serious offensive after its losses in the battles before Verdun. Thus the French immediately made considerable

progress in the direction of the small town of Peronne, which lay about six miles east of the original French lines. On the left wing, the section between Gommecourt and the Ancre, the British advanced to the attack at the same time as the infantry were set in motion further south, and after heavy losses entered the German advanced trenches in many places; but in this section the German guns had never been properly mastered, and before the evening the enemy succeeded in killing or driving back the British, and recaptured their trenches.

Although the British losses were heavy north of the Ancre, it was in the centre that the most fearful fighting occurred. The length of the line between the Ancre and the Somme was about twelve miles. Over the whole of this section the British advanced in the first day, the progress being most marked on the right, where it was helped by the French successes, and least important on the left, where the troops were liable to be enfiladed owing to the failure north of the Ancre. On either side of the main road from Albert to Cambrai the British pressed forward. The villages of La Boisselle, Mametry, Montauban, and Fricourt were seized in the first rush. On the way to Cambrai, the first two small towns which the British were approaching were Combles and Bapaume, the latter being on the above-mentioned main road to Cambrai, about ten miles beyond the British front. For seven miles northwards of the Somme the British troops advanced to a depth of over a thousand yards, and northwards again as far as the left bank of the Ancre smaller advances were made. This was accomplished in one day. In the first two days the British captured 3,500 prisoners and the French about 5,000, but few guns were taken.

At first the largest advances were made by the French, whose extreme left wing extended across to the right bank of the Somme and whose immediate objective was Peronne. On either side of the main road from Bray to Peronne the French pushed forward, and in three days they advanced to a depth of three miles on a front of about six miles and captured the small villages of Frise, Feuillères, Herbecourt, Flaucourt (three miles from Peronne), Assevillers, and Fay. On the third day the French took over 2,000 prisoners. The village of Estrées marked the southern limit of the French line of advance. On July 4 and 5 the French, who were commanded by General Foch, gained more ground, and on the north bank of the Somme captured the village of Hem. This was the most rapid part of the offensive, and during these few days the French once more used their cavalry, a striking incident, for no cavalry had dared to show itself for many months. By the 9th, in spite of counter-attacks by the enemy, the French had advanced as far as Biaches, situated only one mile from Peronne. By about the 10th of the month it became apparent, however, that neither the French nor the British were advancing at the speed necessary for the attainment of any dramatic success. For speed is an essential

element in an offensive of this kind. All experience of the war showed that if the fortifications of the defending side were to be crushed in and burst, with the consequent loss of a large number of guns and prisoners, and causing a general retreat, it must be done quickly, within the space of a few days. The Germans accomplished this a dozen times against the Russians in 1915, and General Brussiloff succeeded in doing it more than once against the Austrians in 1916. But the French failed to do it in Champagne in 1915, the Germans failed to do it at Verdun, and the British and French were not successful in their similar attempt on the Somme. When a fortified line is burst asunder, and the attacking side breaks right through into the open country, a general retreat and great losses in prisoners and guns necessarily ensue. But when an attacking army can only creep forward by stages of a few hundred yards, in an offensive lasting for weeks, the consequence is, not that the same result is achieved more slowly, but that the same result is not attained at all. The extreme slowness of the advance enables the defenders to save nearly all their guns, to avoid any serious losses in prisoners, and during the lapse of weeks to extend their fortifications backwards, so that the fortified line is not burst at all, nor even diminished in depth. The line is merely moved backwards, and a price is exacted from the defenders, but, inevitably, a more severe price is paid by the assaulting army. This is what happened at Verdun, and this is what happened on the Somme.

The casualties during an offensive under these conditions are least serious whilst it is successful, and most terrible when it begins to fail. When the infantry get through, they do so because the hostile resistance has been previously crushed by the artillery, and they are therefore not exposed to any very destructive fire. Contrariwise when an infantry assault fails, the reason is that the troops come up against a fire in which no assault can live, their own guns not having been able to master the defending guns and machine guns. Thus the British casualties south of the Ancre were heavier in the second week than in the first; and for a few days in this second week the daily casualties numbered about 10,000 to the British alone. It was at this point that the advance was brought to a stop by the devastating fire of the German guns, which the British guns could not silence. Fortunately, however, a large proportion of the casualties were slight wounds, and the British losses for the whole month of July were not nearly up to an average of 10,000 a day, the total not exceeding 130,000.

At various points, however, the British continued to creep forward. On July 10, the village of Contalmaison was won, after having changed hands several times. Fierce fighting took place in Trones Wood, south of the village of Longueval. A party of the Royal West Kent regiment were the first to reach Trones Wood, but then the tide of the British advance ebbed,

and they were left within the German lines. For forty-eight hours they held their own in this position. Then the Germans, on July 14, brought up a large force to overwhelm them. The German commander summoned them to surrender, but this was refused. The Germans were just about to annihilate the party when there was once more a general British advance, which came swarming into the wood, and saved the heroic West Kents. The fighting continued with unceasing violence, the Germans delivering constant counter-attacks, but these were almost uniformly repulsed. Having reached Biaches, the French could make no more headway. The Germans having recovered from their first surprise at the French offensive were successful in their defence of Peronne. Longueval, Bazentin le Grand, and Bazentin le Petit were won by the British, however, in the middle of the month. On one occasion the British used cavalry for the first time since 1914—detachments of the Dragoon Guards and Deccan Horse. By July 17 the British had captured altogether fifty-four guns, sixty-six machine guns, and nearly 11,000 prisoners. In the same period the French took eighty-five guns, eighty-nine machine guns, and 12,000 prisoners. In comparison with the numbers engaged these figures are, of course, not large. At the end of July the British made an advance along the main road to Bapaume, and took the village of Pozières, lying over two miles from the spot at which the original British line crossed the road. The maximum depth of the British advance in July was slightly over three miles.

As regards the rest of the Western Front, the district of Verdun was the only sector in which severe fighting took place. All through April, May, and June the Crown Prince of Prussia continued his offensive against this city, but his advances were most meagre and his losses fearfully heavy. The Germans captured Fort Vaux on June 6, and by a terrific assault a fortnight later they succeeded in taking Fleury and Thiaumont (hamlets in advance of Douaumont and only three miles from Verdun itself), on June 23; but the British offensive on the Somme paralysed the German effort on the Meuse, and in all probability was the chief means of saving Verdun from capture.

THE CONQUEST OF GORIZIA.

During August an important victory was gained by the Italian Army, which more than compensated the kingdom for the defeats in Tyrol and Venetia in May. Several times since the beginning of the war the right or eastern wing of the Italian Army had attempted to capture by bombardment and storm the important Austrian town of Gorizia (or Görz), which was the capital of one of the smaller provinces of the empire. The Austrian defences in the eastern section of the Italian front did not at any time run along the frontier, but were some considerable distance within the frontier, seven or eight miles to the

east of that line, on the east bank of the river Isonzo. It was the line of the Isonzo, not the frontier, which the Austrians attempted to defend. In this attempt they were never at any time more than partially successful. They did, indeed, succeed for many months in holding the most vital reaches of the river, in the immediate vicinity of Gorizia, but both below Gorizia and above Tolmino, the Italians had forced the barrier and had established themselves several miles beyond the river. From Plezzo southwards the entire front was in Austrian territory, and from Plezzo to Tolmino the opposing lines were situated, at the beginning of August, several miles to the eastward of the Isonzo. From Tolmino southwards to about five miles below Gorizia, however, the Austrians held the line of the river. But from the village of Petreano to the coast immediately south of Monfalcone, the Italians held both banks of the river, and in places were six or seven miles to the east of it.

On August 4, General Cadorna, the Italian Commander-in-Chief, commenced a general assault upon the Austrian defences in this region. The attacks were strongest firstly to the east of Monfalcone (which the Italians held), and down to the coast, that is, in the district called "the Carso," and secondly, immediately above and below Gorizia. The assault on the Carso plateau was the first to be driven through in earnest, and the Austrians appear to have rushed troops down to this southern sector, and so to have weakened their line farther north to an unwise extent. It is more than possible that the attack in the Carso was deliberately intended by General Cadorna as a feint designed to distract the enemy's attention from the somewhat later, and more serious, assault upon Gorizia itself. However that may have been, this was the effect produced. The assault upon Gorizia developed on the 6th, when the Austrian lines had been weakened in the manner stated.

Gorizia is dominated by two heights, Monte Sabotino to the north-west and San Michele to the south-west, the former being the tactically more important hill. The Italians had almost obtained possession of both these hills in their earlier attacks upon Gorizia in 1915, but on these occasions the storming troops had never been able to maintain their ground. This time they were successful, and by the 8th the summits of both hills were entirely in the hands of the invaders. The great bridge across the river, the western approaches to which the Austrians had held up to this date, was now swept by the Italian guns on these heights, and it was obvious that the fate of Gorizia was sealed. On August 9 Italian troops took possession of the town.

This victory was a notable and remarkable achievement, and was a much greater success than any gained by the Franco-British armies farther north. It must not be forgotten, however, that whereas the desperate offensive of the French and British troops encountered the extremely formidable resistance of the German Army, the Italians in their offensive only had to

deal with the much less efficient Austro-Hungarian forces. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the victory of Gorizia was one of the most important successes won in Western Europe during the whole of the year under consideration. In the pursuit of the retreating enemy cavalry were used on an extensive scale, and between August 4 and August 10 nearly 13,000 prisoners were taken by the Italians; and a dozen guns, over a hundred machine guns and much other booty fell into their hands. The victory, which was so largely won through superior generalship, was a personal triumph for General Cadorna, and gave an effective answer to such criticism as had been directed against him on account of the defeats in Tyrol in May.

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE CAPTURE OF GORIZIA TO THE END OF THE YEAR.

THE WESTERN FRONT.

EXTREMELY heavy fighting continued in the Western Theatre of operations throughout August, September, October, and November, and the number of casualties was very high, especially on the side of the French and British, who were almost invariably the attacking parties, but the territorial changes were negligibly small. The two sections of the line where the severe fighting occurred were those already described in the previous chapters, namely, Verdun and the Somme. In the offensive in September the British employed a new and formidable type of armoured motor-car, the new cars being nicknamed "tanks." These tanks were so heavily built that they were invulnerable to anything except a direct hit from a big gun. On the Somme the most notable advance was the capture of Combles on September 26. The Germans maintained their hold on Peronne. In November the British made small advances at several points. North of the Ancre, where the failure had been complete in July, the villages of Beaumont Hamel and Beaucourt-sur-Ancre were taken on November 14, over 5,000 prisoners being captured. On the road to Bapaume some progress was made, and at the end of the year the British line ran eastward of the village of Le Sars. Near Verdun, east of the Meuse, the French recaptured much of the ground which they had lost in the spring. The village and fort of Douaumont were retaken on October 24, and were subsequently held. At the beginning of November, Fort Vaux was also taken. On both these occasions the Germans lost several thousand men in prisoners alone. Another sudden assault by the French in the middle of December extended their gains beyond Douaumont, and gave them nearly 12,000 more prisoners and over 100 guns.

In December, when the French Cabinet was reconstructed,

General Joffre was appointed Consultative Technical Adviser to the War Committee of the Cabinet, and General Nivelle was made "Commander-in-Chief of the Armies of the North and the East." A few days later it was announced that Joffre had been made a Marshal of France, an extremely high honour, since there had hitherto been no Marshal in the French Army since the establishment of the Third Republic. At the end of the year the preliminary measures were taken for calling up the French 1918 class.

THE BALKAN CAMPAIGN.

Throughout the year the French commander, General Sarraill, had a large and very mixed army under him in Greece, the port of Salonika being his base. This army included French, British, Russians, Italians, Serbians, various British and French colonial contingents, and ultimately also Portuguese. The Bulgarians had occupied a portion of northern and eastern Greece, including Kavala, but for many months there was singularly little fighting between them and General Sarraill's force. In the autumn, however, General Sarraill took the offensive, and French troops took the town of Florina by storm on September 18. The French and Serbian troops on the left of the Allied line then crossed the frontier into Serbian territory, and the British, who were on the right in the valley of the Struma, also engaged in heavy fighting with the Bulgarians. For another two months the Allied line was slowly but steadily advanced, and on November 19 the French troops occupied Monastir, a victory which caused much chagrin in Bulgaria. After this serious defeat, the Germans appear to have sent reinforcements to the Bulgarian front, and consequently the Allies were unable to advance more than a very short distance north of Monastir.

THE ITALIAN THEATRE.

After the capture of Gorizia further violent fighting occurred, and on more than one occasion during the autumn the Italians attempted to renew their advance towards Trieste, but they were unable to make any serious breaches in the new Austrian lines. In the Italian offensives, however, several thousands of Austrian prisoners were captured, the most notable instance of this kind being an assault on the Carso on October 11, when over 5,000 Austrians fell into the hands of the invaders.

THE MAIN RUSSIAN THEATRE.

After the great events of June, the results achieved by the subsequent operations in Russia were of much less importance. During July, August, September, and October the Russian offensive gradually but unmistakably wore itself out, until at

last when the critical weeks arrived for Rumania, that country's great ally was unable to lend any effective aid. The intervention of Rumania was ill-timed to an extent which is almost unintelligible; for had the Rumanian move coincided with the zenith of General Brussiloff's offensive, the total results could hardly have failed to be very different from what they actually were. During the later part of the summer the fighting was very violent south of the Pripet Swamps, and the Russians, who were invariably the attacking party, gained further advantages. Immediately to the south of the Pripet, Brussiloff's men advanced as far as the lower reaches of the Stokhod. In Galicia the railway junction of the Delatyn was taken on July 8, and before the end of the month even the stubborn von Bothmer was compelled to retreat behind Brody. The town of Stanislaw was taken early in August, and the Russian advance was not stayed until it had reached Halicz. At the end of the year the Russian line passed within 25 miles of Kovel and within 50 miles of Lemberg.

THE TURCO-RUSSIAN THEATRE.

No very dramatic events occurred in this scene of operations during the latter part of the year. On July 25 the Russians captured the town of Erzingan, thus completing the conquest of Armenia. (See also Persia.)

THE WAR IN THE AIR.

Although the year was remarkable for the great growth and extension of aerial warfare, it is not possible at the time of writing to give anything approaching a complete chronicle of the war in the air, for there was no subject about which the censorships of the different countries were so extraordinarily severe. No complete data were published, for instance, about the number of aeroplanes in use on the British front in France, neither were complete figures of casualties, rate of usage, etc., vouchsafed. A few facts of a general character were, however, known. On the heavier-than-air side, the French, British, and Germans all continued the remarkably rapid development which had been stimulated by the war, but the relative positions of the combatants were not greatly altered, though any superiority in efficiency which existed was undoubtedly possessed by the Franco-British aviators. Indeed, the Germans themselves admitted on more than one occasion that their own airmen were surpassed by the British pilots.

On the other hand, in the construction and navigation of airships the Germans maintained their enormous lead over all other nations. During the year the wonderful rigid airships, known as Zeppelins, exceeded all their previous records, though, as will be seen, the British, who were the chief subject of their

attentions, found means of making their visits to the English coasts unpleasant. The chief Zeppelin raids on England took place in the spring and in the late summer and autumn, the short summer nights not being favourable to these ventures. Of the raids in the earlier part of the year the most remarkable was one that took place on the night of January 31. In this foray several airships took part. Hitherto, the Zeppelins had only been able to reach and raid the eastern side of England, but on this occasion nearly the whole width of England was crossed, and at least one vessel dropped bombs in the immediate vicinity of Birmingham, and the alarm was sounded for the first time in the towns of the West Country, at Gloucester, Worcester, Chester, and elsewhere.

Up to the end of the year this remained the "record" for the western extension of Zeppelin activities, but the raids of the autumn were carried out by larger fleets, and were of a most dramatic character. About ten smaller raids took place during March and April, but during May, June, and July, England was almost wholly free from these unwelcome visitors. On May 4, however, a British light-cruiser squadron destroyed a Zeppelin off the coast of Schleswig, and on the same day a German airship was brought down by naval guns at Salonika. On the night of July 29, and again on the night of July 31, there were abortive raids on the eastern counties of England, which did no damage whatever, and a third raid in the same week, on the night of August 2, only resulted in the slaughter of a few horses. Three weeks later, on the night of August 24, six Zeppelins raided the east and south-east coasts of England, one vessel approaching London, and in all about 100 bombs were dropped. On this occasion eight persons were reported killed, and a larger number were injured.

On the night of September 2, a fleet of no fewer than thirteen Zeppelins made a raid upon the eastern counties of England, the objectives apparently being London and the industrial towns of the eastern-midland counties. It was stated that the measures which had been taken for darkening the country baffled the enemy, who evidently had much greater difficulty in steering a correct course than the air-captains experienced in the spring. Three of the ships approached London. One of these was caught by a number of searchlights, and was hotly bombarded by anti-aircraft guns and also engaged by aeroplanes, Lieut. Robinson, R.F.C., succeeding in dropping a bomb upon it. The vessel burst into flames within a few minutes, and fell to earth at Cuffley, near Enfield. This incident was witnessed by hundreds of thousands of persons, although it occurred at 2.15 A.M. The other two vessels which approached London, retired on discovering the efficiency of the defences. The thirteen airships dropped a large number of bombs quite promiscuously over the country, but very few people were killed and injured, and no very great damage was done. The ship destroyed was the "L 21."

On the night of September 23, another big raid was carried out, twelve Zeppelins taking part in the operations on this occasion. Two of these were destroyed, but this time the damage done was more serious and the number of persons killed and injured was larger. The attack on London, made by two of the airships, was repulsed without difficulty. Both the airships destroyed came down in Essex. One of them fell in flames, and all the crew were killed, but the other had merely been disabled, and being forced to descend, the crew surrendered to a special constable. About forty persons were killed by bombs and about 130 were injured. The two airships destroyed were the "L 32" and the "L 33," these being naval Zeppelins of very recent construction.

On the night of September 25, yet another raid on England was carried out by seven airships, some damage being done to the industrial towns of the Midlands. On this occasion none of the aerial vessels was destroyed. According to the official report thirty-six persons were killed by bombs and twenty-seven were injured.

The later raids were much more serious for the Zeppelins than for England. A number of airships visited the Eastern counties on the night of October 1, and one of the Zeppelins was brought down in the London district, at Potters Bar. Again on the night of November 25, a fleet of Zeppelins approached and crossed the coast of Durham and Yorkshire. One vessel was brought down into the sea by an aeroplane of the Royal Flying Corps at 11.45 P.M. A second Zeppelin was also destroyed, and in this case a most exciting chase took place. The vessel in question dropped a large number of bombs over the North-Midland countries, but on the way back to the coast she was attacked by aeroplanes of the Royal Flying Corps and was bombarded by the anti-aircraft guns. She was damaged but was able to proceed slowly. On approaching the coast of Norfolk the German aeronauts succeeded in repairing the damage which had been done, and sailing at a height of over 8,000 feet, the vessel proceeded out to sea at a high speed. At sea, however, she was greeted by four warplanes of the Royal Naval Air Service, and also by gunfire from an armed trawler. Thus encircled the hapless Zeppelin was doomed, and at 6.45 A.M. she fell into the sea in flames.

On November 28, a few hours after this Zeppelin was destroyed, a German aeroplane visited London and there dropped six bombs. This attack took place at about noon, but the weather was misty at the time, and the aviator flew at a great height. Nine persons were injured by the bombs. The aeroplane made good its escape.

THE WAR AT SEA.

Apart from the continuous pressure of the British blockade to which reference was made in Chapter II, the maritime war

was not very eventful during the later months of the year, and no great sea battles were fought. On the side of the enemy perhaps the most remarkable incident, and the most creditable achievement, was the voyage of a submarine commercial blockade-runner, named the *Deutschland*. It occurred to the German Admiralty that by building submarines which should be in all respects mercantile vessels, the effects of the British blockade might be mitigated. The vessel *Deutschland* was therefore built and was dispatched across the Atlantic at the end of June, and arrived safely at the port of Norfolk, Virginia, on July 9. The American authorities declared that the submarine fulfilled all the conditions of a genuine merchantman. The return passage was also made safely, and later in the year the *Deutschland* repeated her Transatlantic voyage, but another mercantile submarine, the *Bremen*, appears to have been lost. Although the skill and seamanship displayed by the captain and crew of the *Deutschland* were to be admired, such small incidents as these could, of course, exercise no appreciable effect upon the situation caused by the blockade.

On the night of October 26, ten German destroyers executed a daring raid into the English Channel, and when near Boulogne sunk an empty British transport and the destroyer *Flirt*, and so seriously damaged the destroyer *Nubian* that it became necessary to run her aground. The British Admiralty at first announced categorically that two of the German destroyers had been sunk, but subsequently admitted that this statement was founded upon surmise only. Much surprise was caused by the ability of the Germans to pass through the Straits of Dover. On the night of November 23, six German destroyers made another raid into the Straits of Dover, reaching the Downs, but on this occasion they did no damage.

At the beginning of October a German war-submarine, the U 53, crossed the Atlantic, visited Newport, Rhode Island, and then put to sea again, and sank about a dozen merchant vessels near the Nantucket Lightship.

On August 19, a portion of the German High Seas Fleet came out some considerable distance into the North Sea and a short action with the British forces ensued. Two British light cruisers, the *Nottingham* and the *Falmouth*, were sunk by submarines, and one German submarine was certainly sunk and another was probably sunk. The German battleship *Westfalen* was torpedoed, but did not sink.

Amongst the other incidents which occurred, the sinking of the old French battleship *Gaulois* in the Mediterranean on December 27 may be mentioned. In this case, too, a submarine was responsible for the enemy's success.

At the end of November, Admiral Sir John Jellicoe was made First Sea Lord of the Admiralty, and Vice-Admiral Sir David Beatty took over the supreme command of the Grand Fleet.

THE RUMANIAN CAMPAIGN.

The entrance of Rumania into the war on the side of the Allied Powers on August 27, led to the most important military operations of the whole year, and the developments were of a most dramatic character. The strategy of this new campaign was perhaps more interesting than that of any other operations in the entire war.

At a moment when the Central Empires were with difficulty resisting the combined offensives on their Western, Italian, and Russian fronts, a new enemy appeared who extended the length of the lines to be defended by several hundred miles and added a fresh army of 700,000 men to the forces of the Entente. It was not surprising that the peoples of the Entente countries believed that at last the time had come when the lines of the German armies would give way, and the flood of the Entente millions would surge through the gaps with a momentum that no human force could stay. Yet the result was very different; and it was an extraordinary tribute to the importance of generalship, of what is colloquially called the factor of "brains," even in modern war, that the accession of 700,000 bayonets to the Entente was far more than counterbalanced by changes which the German Emperor was sagacious enough to make in his Higher Command.

The geographical position of this new ally of the four Peripheral Powers gave those Powers great strategic opportunities, the more so, in that although the German and Austro-Hungarian authorities appear to have regarded the eventual intervention of Rumania as virtually inevitable, they seem to have been surprised that the move came so soon, and on the frontier of that district of Hungary known as Transylvania the enemy were caught unprepared.

A consideration of the geographical position of Rumania will show at once in what respects that country's intervention gave opportunities to the Entente. For both political and strategic reasons, the capture of Constantinople was one of the prime objects of the war. Hitherto Russia's land-route to the Ottoman capital had been the very indirect one through the Caucasus, Armenia, and western Asia Minor; along this difficult and lengthy route, the Grand-Duke Nicholas had progressed an appreciable distance, but he still had far to go. But the intervention of Rumania opened to the Tsar's troops the direct and historic road to Constantinople, the road that the Slavonic armies had traversed with such great success in the war of 1877. Moreover, this direct route was the more easy in that the greatest natural barrier across Russia's path, the river Danube, was by the course of Rumania's political boundaries already in Entente possession. It will be remembered that in the vicinity of Rustchuk the Danube alters its course, and flows north rather than east, and a few miles below Rustchuk the river ceased to

be the boundary between Bulgaria and Rumania, and flowed deep into Rumanian territory. Not until the Danube reaches Galatz, 150 miles further north, does it resume its easterly course, and near this town it becomes (at the time of writing) the Russo-Rumania frontier. The extensive territory lying between these roughly north-and-south reaches of the Danube on the west and the Black Sea on the east is known as the Dobrudja. Thus the possession of the Dobrudja by Rumania was of the highest value to Russia, because it meant possession of both banks of the Danube, and the free gift of the chief natural obstacle to a march on Constantinople. Not only would a Russo-Rumanian advance southwards from the Dobrudja have the ultimate prospect of reaching the Turkish capital, it would also have the more immediate purpose, in combination with General Sarraill's army at Salonika, of taking the Bulgarians between two fires, and thus crushing those most hated enemies of the Tsardom, at the same time cutting Germany's great railway to the Orient. The other frontiers of Rumania need a short description. Opposite Hungary the Rumanian frontier was that pointed out by physical geography, namely, the crescentic line of the Carpathian mountains. It will be observed that the course of the Carpathians caused Transylvania to jut out as a political promontory—a strategic salient—into Rumanian territory. This point was, as will be seen, of military importance. A number of large passes through this part of the Carpathian range exist. From west to east, the most important of these passes are (1) the Vulkan Pass, leading to the Turgu Jiu, (2) the Roter Turm, (3) the Torzburg, (4) the Predeal, (5) the Buza, and further to the north-east (6) the Gyimes Pass. Of these the Roter Turm, Predeal, and Gyimes passes were traversed by railways at the beginning of the campaign.

The Rumanian war began, as was to be expected, by a great Rumanian rush. This did not, however, take the form of a powerful joint Russo-Rumanian offensive along the route to Constantinople. There was, to the surprise of most onlookers, no serious attempt whatever to seize this great opportunity. The rush was in the other direction, that is, over the Carpathian passes into Transylvania. The Rumanian movements were very rapid, and these operations were closely analogous psychologically and to some extent comparable strategically to the first rush of the French army into Alsace-Lorraine at the very beginning of the war.

The Rumanians swept through the Predeal Pass and occupied Kronstadt on August 30. The same day cavalry entered the small town of Petroseny, eight miles north of the Vulkan Pass, and the invaders also seized another small town named Kesdi-Vasarhely, lying north-east of Kronstadt and nearly twenty miles within the Hungarian frontier. Great joy was expressed in Rumania at these preliminary successes. On September 1, the Austro-Hungarian garrison also evacuated the

important town of Hermannstadt, one of the chief centres of the so-called "Saxon" section of the population of Transylvania. Hermannstadt is situated near the northern exit of the Roter Turm Pass. It will be noticed that this advance was on the Rumanian left wing. On the right wing, in the direction of Bukovina, where the Rumanian and Russian armies adjoined, there was no considerable advance, the Austro-German forces holding their ground in this region from the first. On September 7 the Rumanians captured the town of Orsova, on the Danube, close to the spot at which Serbia, Hungary, and Rumania met.

Meanwhile the enemy was not inactive. On August 30 a momentous announcement was made in Berlin. The official statement in question read as follows: "By Imperial order the Emperor has removed from office the Chief of the General Staff, General von Falkenhayn, who will be employed in another capacity, and has appointed Field-Marshal von Beneckendorff und Hindenburg Chief of the General Staff of the Field Army, and Lieutenant-General von Ludendorff First Quartermaster-General, with the rank of General."

General von Falkenhayn suffered from the great German reverse before Verdun. He had always held that the best strategy for Germany was to aim at a decisive victory in the West, and he was responsible for the disastrous plan of an assault upon the French lines on the Meuse. He had shown abilities in 1915, in particular in planning, in conjunction with von Mackensen, the conquest of Serbia; but Verdun had been a blow to his reputation from which he could hardly expect to recover, although, as will be seen, in a less elevated position he won victories of considerable merit before the year was out.

The Emperor's action in appointing von Hindenburg Chief of the General Staff was a timely recognition of the actual achievements of the different strategists under war conditions. Von Falkenhayn had been a much more prominent figure than von Hindenburg before the war. But the latter General was unquestionably the greatest commander who had come to the front, on the German side, since the opening of hostilities. Tannenberg and Warsaw stood to his credit, and the whole eastern campaign had been shaped by his genius. Von Hindenburg had always held, in contrast with von Falkenhayn, that it was against Russia that Germany might reasonably hope to gain decisive victories. He had opposed the weakening of the Austrian lines in Volhynia in order to find troops for the offensive in Tyrol, and he had condemned the calamitous adventure at Verdun. In his opinion, the German Army ought to act upon the defensive in France, and endeavour to regain the initiative in the East. When von Hindenburg reached the highest position in the German Army, a position which for all practical purposes was that of Commander-in-Chief, he was 68 years of age.

Now although the Austro-German forces had been ill-prepared to oppose an invasion of Transylvania, on the more vitally important frontier, to wit, the northern border of Bulgaria, the Central Powers were ready to meet the contingency of a Rumanian declaration of war. An army had been collected here, consisting mainly of Bulgarian and Turkish troops, with a stiffening of Germans, and this force was under the command of no less a general than von Mackensen himself. From the fact that this famous commander had been dispatched to this spot, it is evident that the authorities in Berlin had not failed to appreciate the pre-eminent importance of the route to Constantinople. Less than a week after the new war broke out, on September 2, Mackensen's cavalry crossed the border and found the country only weakly held by the Rumanians. The events which followed were the first revelation to the world of the miscalculations of the Rumanian General Staff. Blunders were committed to which no parallel can be found in any of the operations of the war, save perhaps in the original Austro-Hungarian expedition against Serbia. Von Mackensen's move took the sleepy Rumanian generals quite by surprise. By a rapid stroke the German commander took the town of Tutrakan on September 6, nearly 25,000 Rumanians being surrounded and captured, together with about 100 guns, and much war material. The remnants of the Rumanian Army which had been guarding the frontier of the Dobrudja fled northwards, and on September 10 von Mackensen entered Silistria without serious resistance.

After the fall of Tutrakan the Government at Bukarest began to appreciate the situation, and General Averesco, who was reckoned to be the best Rumanian strategist and had accordingly been placed in command of the army invading Transylvania, was transferred to the Dobrudja. General Crainiceano was promoted to command the army in Transylvania.

Meanwhile the Austro-Hungarian Army in Transylvania was carrying out a strategic retreat. This was almost the first instance in the whole war of a real strategic retreat. It is true that on many occasions both sides, in their official communiqués, described retreats as strategic retirements—such, for instance, as the German retreat from the Marne and the numerous Russian retreats—but in these cases the expression was a mere euphemism to cover up a defeat. In this instance, the Hungarian officers were really avoiding battle for strategic reasons. The rearguards gave ground, merely delaying the Rumanian advance, and the great salient made by the conformation of the Transylvanian frontier began to sink in and vanish. North and west of the Torzburg, Predeal, Buza, Oitoz, and Gyimes passes, the Rumanians penetrated far into the Plain of Hungary. But they captured no prisoners, for the opposing forces always evaded them. In three weeks the Rumanians advanced fifty miles into Transylvania, and their

advanced forces reached the neighbourhood of the town of Hom Almas. The advance was greatest in the centre; the two wings made much less progress, and the left wing never advanced more than four or five miles beyond Hermannstadt and Petroseny.

About September 20 the Austro-Hungarian forces ceased to retreat, and the Rumanians found that their further advance was meeting with serious opposition. In the three weeks which had elapsed, von Hindenburg had been quickly withdrawing troops from other fronts, especially from the West, and German troops were sent to Transylvania in great force. The new Chief of the General Staff was deliberately prepared to take risks in the West in order that he might have sufficient troops available in the East to regain the initiative and repeat his triumphs of 1915.

The Austro-German line in Hungary now passed approximately straight across the base of the Transylvanian "promontory," from Dorna Watra to Hermannstadt; and on this shortened line von Hindenburg concentrated a great army of at least 400,000 men, well supplied with guns, and General von Falkenhayn was placed in command. The appearance of the enemy in this strength surprised General Crainiceano, and he evacuated Hermannstadt, and on his left was quickly forced to withdraw his men into the protection of the Vulkan Pass.

In the meantime, von Mackensen's troops advancing from Silistria had reached a point only fifteen miles south of the important port of Constanza. The Rumanian army in the Dobrudja had been reinforced by Russian troops, and had taken up a defensive line running parallel with the eastern segment of the Bukarest-Constanza railway, and situated about 12 miles south of that railway. Von Mackensen's forces were at this time entirely confined to the right bank of the Danube, but they had now penetrated about 80 miles into the Dobrudja.

At the end of September von Falkenhayn fought a battle south of Hermannstadt, and by means of an encircling movement from the west Bavarian troops seized the northern exit of the Roter Turm Pass, in the rear of the Rumanian force. The greater part of the Rumanian force engaged in this battle escaped capture by fleeing to the east, and the Germans took only 3,000 prisoners, but owing to the impassable nature of the transverse roads the defeated force was compelled to abandon virtually the whole of its baggage, and about 700 railway trucks and 10 locomotives were abandoned north of the pass, thus falling into the hands of the advancing Germans. The Rumanian force beat a disorderly retreat eastwards until it reached the Torzburg Pass, which was still securely held by the central Rumanian army.

From this point onwards the Rumanian troops were steadily overpowered. They were, for some unexplained reason, insufficiently supplied with heavy guns, and another factor in the

defeats doubtless was the lack of enthusiasm for the war among many of the rank and file, who failed to comprehend the somewhat esoteric politico-ethnological reasons which had caused their Government to intervene in the conflict (see Rumania). But the chief cause of the Rumanian defeats was the inferior quality of Rumanian generalship, which was revealed the more painfully, in that the Rumanian leaders found themselves matched against the very flower of the German General Staff, Hindenburg, Ludendorff, Mackensen, Falkenhayn.

On October 4 and 5 the most advanced troops of the Rumanian Army were defeated near Szekely-Udvarhely, and a general and rapid retreat began. On October 5, 6, and 7 Falkenhayn won a victory near Kronstadt (Brasso), and on the 8th that town was retaken. The Germans captured over 30 guns in this engagement. The Rumanians who had been engaged near Kronstadt fell back upon the three passes leading into Rumania from this district of Hungary—the Torzburg, Predeal, and Buza passes. So rapid was the Rumanian retreat, that by the middle of October the invaders of Transylvania had fallen back to the general line of the Carpathians and were defending their own frontier, and General Averesco, deceived by the lull on Mackensen's front, came hurrying back to the Hungarian frontier. In the middle of October Falkenhayn's troops pierced a way through the Torzburg Pass, and began making their way down the Rumanian slope, though as yet they had not reached the rail-head at Kimpolung, 16 miles within the Rumanian frontier. The Germans also pressed through the Gyimes Pass, much further to the north-east, but in this region they were subsequently repulsed.

The attention of the Rumanian Government and the Rumanian generals having now been diverted to the Carpathians, Mackensen struck another sudden blow on October 19. The Rumanian line running from Rasova on the Danube to Tuzla on the Black Sea was smashed, the trunk railway was seized, and on October 22 the Bulgaro-German troops entered Constanza in triumph. Within a few days the entire stretch of the railway from Tchernavoda to Constanza was in possession of the enemy, and this gave them the eastern end of the famous Carol Bridge across the Danube, at Tchernavoda. The Rumanians in their retirement did not seriously damage the bridge, possibly thinking that so long as they held the western end of that valuable structure, its existence would be of little use to the Germans. Constanza normally contains great stocks of grain and oil, but before evacuating the town the Rumanians destroyed the greater part of these supplies, and in this victory in the Dobrudja the Germans only claimed to have captured 12 guns and about 7,000 men.

On October 25 the Vulkan Pass was stormed by von Falkenhayn's men. During the first half of November there was fierce fighting in all the Carpathian passes, the Austro-

German forces making slow but steady progress. In October the Rumanians had made a diversion across the Danube into Bulgaria, but nothing came of this move, and the initiative remained with the enemy. The passes appear to have been inadequately fortified, and in none of the valleys were the Rumanians able to stay the progress of the Germans for more than a few days. The Vulkan, the Roter Turm, the Torzburg, the Predeal—all were lost. Yet for a couple of weeks longer the Rumanian Army retreated fighting, and made the enemy pay dearly for the ground he was gaining. In the middle of November, however, about November 14 to 16, a battle was fought below the Vulkan Pass, near the rail-head at Tirgu Jiu, which was decisive of the whole Rumanian campaign. Falkenhayn had now brought his heavy guns through the passes, and faced by superior artillery, and incessantly outmanœuvred, the unfortunate Rumanian soldiers defending Tirgu Jiu broke in panic. The right wing of Falkenhayn's army swept on into the fertile plain of Wallachia. In the second half of November the developments were extremely rapid, and the movements of Falkenhayn's and Mackensen's armies were co-ordinated in that perfect manner which characterised the great German advance on Warsaw in the previous year. On November 21 the large town of Craiova, the junction of the railways coming from Orsova and Tirgu Jiu, was occupied by the Germans.

When the Rumanian army at Tirgu Jiu was routed, the army much further west at Orsova did not retire, but continued to hold its ground. The loss of Craiova consequently severed the railway communications of this force, and its retreat was rendered almost impossible.

The right wing of Falkenhayn's force was now situated not more than 30 miles from the left bank of the Danube. This great sweeping movement was accomplished by the troops who had come through the Vulkan Pass; south of the Roter Turm and Torzburg passes the Rumanians were still yielding ground very slowly. On November 24 Mackensen threw his troops across the Danube at several points. It was expected that the Rumanians in retiring eastward from Craiova would attempt to hold the line of the river Aluta, which flows southwards across Rumania from the Roter Turm Pass to the Danube, but Falkenhayn reached this river on the 24th and forced a passage without difficulty. On the 27th, Mackensen captured the town of Giurgevo, on the left bank of the Danube, due south of Bukarest, and two days earlier his scouts had already established contact with those of Falkenhayn, so that before the end of November the German armies formed a complete line across Rumania. The town of Pitesti was taken on November 29, and on the same day the invaders reached the rail-head at Kimpolung, below the Torzburg Pass.

Bukarest was now enclosed within a wide ring of fire, which was complete on all sides save the east. A desperate offensive

by the Russians in the north of Rumania and in Bukovina, made in order to create a diversion, failed to break the German defences, and was beaten off by the local contingents. On the line of the river Argesu the Rumanians made a last desperate attempt to save their capital, but their resistance was broken by the Austro-German guns, and on December 2 and 3 the invaders crossed the river in force. This sealed the fate of Bukarest, and after the defeat on the Argesu the retreat became a rout. The invaders captured over 20,000 prisoners and more than a 100 guns; and on December 6 the Austro-German forces occupied Bukarest. The important town of Ploesti also fell on December 6, and on the following day the Orsova army, consisting of one division, was compelled to capitulate.

The subsequent operations during the last three weeks of the year were less dramatic in character. The Rumanians retreated rapidly eastwards of Bukarest, and did not attempt to make a stand until they reached the line of the River Sereth. Von Mackensen's men cleared the whole of the Dobrudja of the Russians and the Rumanians, and thus secured the entire course of the Danube as a defensive line in the event of any great Russian move on the route to Constantinople, of which, however, there was no immediate likelihood. At the end of the year the Rumanians were defending the line of the Sereth, and were still on the right bank of that river.

THE WAR OF ATTRITION.

At the time of writing it is unfortunately not practicable to give full and reliable facts relating to the process of attrition up to the end of December. During the year several of the belligerent Governments ceased to publish the totals of the casualties of their respective armies, and even prohibited the publication of semi-official compilations of such totals. Thus the French casualties were not made known in England after the beginning of the year, and the estimates of the Austro-Hungarian totals ceased to be reliable. Similarly, it became increasingly difficult to compute the Russian losses, and it is possible that the exact totals were not even known to the Russian Government itself. The British Government also ceased to give out the totals of British casualties.

In these circumstances, it is not possible to do much more than note certain broad considerations bearing upon this highly important question. It is certain that during 1916 the wastage of the Entente was proportionately, and possibly even actually, smaller than that of the Central Alliance. The process of attrition which was favourable to the larger coalition in 1914 and 1915, was more favourable in 1916. In the Eastern theatre the Russian losses were very much less severe than those sustained in 1915, whilst on the other hand the Austro-

Hungarian losses in June and July were extremely heavy. In the western theatre the casualties of the opposing sides were probably approximately equal—which, be it remembered, means that they were very unequal in proportion to the total numbers of the respective armies. The German casualties in the unsuccessful assault upon Verdun were very heavy, but these were counterbalanced by the very serious losses incurred by the Franco-British forces in the precisely comparable offensive on the Somme. The absence of official British statistics, though no doubt necessary, led to exaggerated statements on this matter being made in certain quarters; and it was sometimes forgotten that although the battle of the Somme continued for four months, the rate of losses incurred in the first month, July, was not subsequently maintained. It was not the case that the British had half a million casualties on the Somme. The aggregate wastage of the white manhood of the British Empire up to the end of 1916 was certainly not much more than one-third that of the manhood of Germany—the latter country having a population only slightly greater.

The German Government continued to publish full details of the German casualties in a characteristically methodical manner. The totals of the losses reported up to the end of the year, that is, approximately those incurred up to the end of November, are shown below. As in Chapter I., half the “missing” have been classed as dead and half as prisoners, and trifling injuries have been ignored:—

Killed or died	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,109,000
Prisoners	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	372,000
Severely wounded	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	531,000
Wounded	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,782,000
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>3,794,000</u>

It will be noticed that in the ten months, February to November, the Germans suffered over 1,200,000 casualties, about 350,000 soldiers being killed.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

THE END OF THE SESSION.

THE end of the year 1915 left the country in a considerable ferment as to the question of Compulsory Military Service. It will be remembered that prophecies had been freely made of a revolutionary movement among the working classes, and the internal condition of the country was held by many to be more unsettled than it had been for a very long time past. These anticipations were, however, altogether dissipated by the reception which was accorded to the measure on its introduction at the beginning of the year.

The only dissentient member of the Cabinet was Sir John Simon, whose resignation was announced on January 1. At the same time, the report of the result of the Derby Scheme was issued. It will be remembered that that Scheme had been in operation from October 23 to December 15, and the understanding was that Compulsory Service would be introduced if any considerable proportion of unmarried men remained unattested when the Scheme closed. The figures showed, indeed, that the unattested residue could by no means be considered as a "negligible quantity." It was estimated that the grand total of men of military age in the country was 5,011,441, of whom the total number of attested, enlisted and rejected men amounted to 2,829,263. This left an unaccounted residue of 2,182,178, of which number 1,029,231 were set down as unmarried. Deducting 378,071 of this number as an estimated figure for badged and reserve and indispensable men, the number of single men left over amounted to 651,160. Accordingly, it was agreed on all hands that the first business of Parliament must be to redeem the pledge given by Mr. Asquith and deal at once with the measure for the introduction of Compulsory Military Service.

The House of Commons met on January 4, when Mr. Asquith officially announced that Sir John Simon had resigned the office of Home Secretary. The greater part of the day, however, was occupied by Mr. Lloyd George, who was called upon to defend his department from criticism from various directions. The most important perhaps of these concerned the suppression of the newspaper *Forward*. Mr. Thomas put a question to the Government, which suggested that there had

been differential treatment as between Labour newspapers and other newspapers in the country, to which the Under-Secretary-for-War replied he had not been aware, until now, that *Forward* was an organ of labour; all he had understood was that it had incited the workers on the Clyde to abstain from making munitions. Mr. Lloyd George confirmed this charge against the Labour journal; and, replying to Mr. Snowden, denied that it had been suppressed for reporting the meeting which he had held at Glasgow on Christmas Day. At length it was promised that a further opportunity should be given for the discussion of this subject.

That opportunity arose on a motion for the adjournment of the House on January 10. The discussion was started by Mr. Pringle, who contended that the newspaper had been suppressed because it had reported the Christmas Day meeting, with all the interruptions and oppositions which had taken place there; and this though the report was accurate and the conductors of the newspaper had not been sent any warning by the Press Bureau against publishing an independent account of the meeting. Mr. Lloyd George denied that the report of his meeting had had anything to do with the suppression, and had no difficulty in showing that *Forward* had committed various offences under the Defence of the Realm Act, such as the discouragement of recruiting and the incitement of Clyde workmen not to turn out munitions. Mr. Anderson, the Labour member for a Sheffield division, stated that the suppression of criticism published in *Forward* had had a very bad effect in the Clyde Valley, and that the visit of Mr. Lloyd George had done a great deal of harm. The subject was then allowed to drop.

The only other subject of importance which was discussed on the opening day of the House of Commons was the Munitions of War (Amendment) Bill, of which Mr. Lloyd George moved the recommittal, in order to insert new clauses designed to facilitate the dilution of skilled labour by assuring unskilled workmen fair conditions. These clauses were cordially welcomed by the Labour Party and had a speedy passage through the Committee. The House then considered the Bill as amended, and it was recommitted a second time in order that the Minister of Munitions might add a further new clause dealing with restrictions on the change from Trade Union to Non-Union labour in controlled establishments. Thus, the measure, when it was read the third time, had had three Committee and three Report stages. Mr. Pringle expressed an alarming view of the situation, declaring that not Munition Tribunals but Army Corps would be necessary to preserve peace on the Clyde if there were much repressive legislation. A similar warning was uttered by Mr. Sherwell with regard to the feeling among the working men of the West Riding, but Mr. Lloyd George defended himself by pointing out that both the Munitions Act and the Defence of the Realm Act marked a tremendous leap forward in industrial

evolution; that State-control of workshops, the limitation of profits, the minimum wage, the prevention of sweating, were all enshrined in these Acts of Parliament.

The Bill for introducing Compulsory Military Service was brought in by Mr. Asquith on January 5. The main provisions of it were as follows: Unattested single men and childless widowers between the ages of 18 and 40 were to be treated as though they had attested under Lord Derby's Group System. Men were not to be called up for service till the 21st day after the date on which the Act came into force, and this date might be 14 days after the Royal assent was given. Service was to be for the duration of the war, and Ireland was excluded from the Bill. Ministers of religion and men rejected on medical grounds since August 14, 1915, were excepted altogether; and exemption was also allowed to men employed in necessary national work, men who were the sole support of dependants, men physically unfit, and those who conscientiously objected to combatant service; but, in the last case, the exemption was to be from combatant military duty only. The Bill included a scheme for setting up Tribunals, which were to deal with the claims for exemption.

The Prime Minister, when introducing the Bill, reminded the House of the figures of Lord Derby's report, which he regarded, on the whole, as encouraging, and as not justifying general compulsion. The Bill which he had now to introduce was devoted solely to the purpose of redeeming the promise given by him in the House on November 2. That pledge, he said, had been given to save the voluntary system in the crisis of its operation. Its effect was that large numbers of married men had attested who would not have done so if they had apprehended that they would be called up in the earlier groups. Even if the figure of unattested unmarried men returned by Lord Derby were reduced by half on account of medical unfitness, the hypothetical number remaining was considerable. Thus the occasion for redeeming the pledge had arisen, and the Government asked Parliament to fulfil it by enacting that unattested single men of military age who had no grounds for exemption or any other excuse should be treated as though they had attested under Lord Derby's Group Scheme. As the House showed some impatience when Mr. Asquith named conscientious objection as ground of exemption, he pointed out that he was merely following the precedent adopted in Australia and South Africa, and repeated that the exemption was from combatant service only.

The main opposition to the Bill came from Sir John Simon, who henceforward became the acknowledged leader of a small group in the House, which was formed to oppose what they considered to be unwarrantable interference with individual freedom. The main point in his speech was an endeavour to show that the number of unattested men was in fact a negligible

minority, and did not therefore call for any special measures for the redemption of the pledge. But Sir John Simon also declared that he regarded the question as one of vital principle and that measures of this character were contrary to the highest traditions of the British people.

The Labour Party, far from showing any unqualified opposition to the Bill, seemed to be divided in their opinion. Mr. Hodge expressed his readiness to be guided by the necessities of the times, while Mr. Thomas denounced the Bill as conscription. General Seely appealed to the House to pass the Bill without delay, while Mr. Redmond, on behalf of the Nationalists, stated that his party would vote against it on the grounds that the necessity for it had not been established, although he dissociated himself from the rigid view of compulsion expressed by Sir John Simon. After a brief speech by Mr. Bonar Law, the debate was adjourned to the following day.

On its resumption, Mr. William O'Brien thanked the Government for having left Ireland out of the Bill, and announced that he, for his part, intended to leave Great Britain to settle the purely British question for herself; but the main reply to Sir John Simon came from Mr. Samuel, who declared that he had been driven by logical facts to support the Bill against all his predilections. Further support for the Bill came from Mr. J. M. Robertson, the Liberal member for the Tyneside division, and from Mr. John Ward, the former Secretary of the Navvies' Union, who now wore the uniform of a Colonel in the Army. Many other members joined in the debate before Mr. R. D. Holt expressed his agreement with Sir John Simon and made a speech opposing the Bill as a matter of vital principle. The debate was finally wound up by Mr. Balfour, who spoke as an old opponent of general conscription, and testified in the most cordial terms to the success of the voluntary system. He claimed that the debate had demonstrated our national unity; he would not allow that there was a serious dissension, either in the House or the country in regard to the prosecution of the war, and he appealed to the House to refrain from taking a vote on the question which, as it was not a matter of principle, might be misunderstood by our enemies, and even by our friends. Nevertheless the House divided, 403 members voting for the Bill and 105 against, the first reading being thus carried by a majority of 298. In addition to the Nationalist Party the minority included 34 Liberals and 11 Labour members.

The second reading of the Military Service (No. 2) Bill was taken by the House of Commons on January 11. The outstanding features of the discussion were the withdrawal of the Nationalists from active opposition and the division in the ranks of the Labour Party. As regards the latter, a Labour Congress had been held in the meanwhile, the conclusions of which were somewhat obscure. In any case, few of the Labour members were in attendance at the House and those who were present

were divided in opinion. Even the Labour Ministers were absent.

The rejection was moved by Mr. Anderson, whose chief point was that the workmen suspected the Military Service Bill of being a means of introducing military discipline into the workshops through the Military Service Tribunals, which had the power of holding over single workmen of military age the threat of being sent to the trenches. The rejection was seconded by Mr. R. C. Lambert, the Liberal member for the Cricklade division, who founded his opposition very largely on considerations of religion and conscience. The next speaker was Mr. Redmond, who announced the withdrawal of the Irish Party from active opposition. He said that they had changed their attitude on finding that the British representatives had voted by 10 to 1 in favour of this purely British measure, and the Irish members considered, therefore, that the matter was no longer any concern of theirs. Sir Edward Carson, who followed, expressed regret that Mr. Redmond had not taken an even stronger line, and pressed him to consider the effect which would have been produced upon our enemies if he had boldly supported the Bill and asked for the inclusion of Ireland. That country, he declared, had not done half as well as Great Britain, a remark which called forth a brief protest from Mr. Redmond. In a later speech, Mr. Long, the President of the Local Government Board, pointed out triumphantly that the controversy was now effectively over, and he congratulated the House on the practical unanimity which had resulted from the debate.

The discussion of the second reading was concluded on the following day. Sir John Simon again spoke and gave expression to the fear which, undoubtedly, animated such opposition as there was in the country, the fear namely lest the provisions of the Bill might be used to institute industrial compulsion. He was again answered by Mr. Asquith, who claimed that his pledge preserved the voluntary system, but the main argument of the Prime Minister was that of military necessity: "On behalf of the whole of my colleagues I say to the House and to the country that unless we pass this Bill, we cannot do our part in the prosecution of this war." He said there was nothing further from the intention of the framers of the Bill than that it should be used for the establishment of industrial compulsion, but to put the matter beyond all doubt the Government was engaged in devising machinery and safeguards which would make the use of the Bill for such a purpose impossible. Finally, he appealed to the House to read the Bill a second time without a division, for he believed that this in itself would strike an effective blow at the enemy. Further speeches of note were made by Mr. Snowden, who criticised the Bill in very vigorous language, and by Mr. Henderson, the leader of the Labour Party, who affirmed that the choice was between compulsion and possible defeat. Nevertheless, the minority insisted on a

division and the second reading was carried by 431 votes against 39. There was thus carried after four days' discussion the principle of one of the most important constitutional measures that had ever been debated in the House of Commons.

Four more days were occupied by the Committee stage which began on January 17. The most important amendment was one moved by Mr. Chambers, who represented a Belfast constituency, urging the inclusion of Ireland in the Bill, a demand which was supported by Colonel Craig. Mr. Bonar Law, who was in charge of the Bill, admitted that he would not have consented to the exclusion of Ireland if this had been a question of permanent national defence, but this Bill had only one purpose in view, namely, to get soldiers for the war with the least friction and division. We should lose more, he said, than we should gain by trying to enforce it in Ireland. He fully recognised the unprecedented co-operation of all parties in this war; and was interrupted by Mr. Dillon, who exclaimed that the overwhelming majority of Nationalists in Ireland were on the side of Great Britain. After Mr. Bonar Law had deprecated a division on the subject, Sir Edward Carson advised his friends to withdraw the amendment without further debate. Ultimately, it was negatived without a division, a number of Liberal members refusing permission for its withdrawal.

The next amendment to be moved was one by Sir Ivor Herbert, who desired to bring within the province of the Bill all youths as they attained the age of eighteen years. During the discussion of this amendment on the following day, Mr. Long made an urgent appeal to his friends not to press it, on the grounds that it was beyond the scope of the Prime Minister's pledge; and he reinforced his appeal by a message from Lord Kitchener, who had informed him that morning that he did not desire the amendment to be carried. "He says," continued Mr. Long, "that by bringing in all the suitable unmarried men, and all the married men who have attested, it will give him and the country all the men that are required, which will enable him to do all that is necessary, in his own words, to 'secure victory'." This appeal had little effect, however, upon Sir Ivor Herbert who said that one of the most remarkable things in the war had been the total eclipse of the Secretary-of-State-for-War behind the shadow of a figure. He did indeed consent to withdraw his amendment, but was careful to explain that it was not out of deference to the authority of Lord Kitchener.

Another amendment was then moved by Sir John Simon with the view of sifting all the single men of military age before enlistment, in order to ascertain whether the unexcepted and the unexempted were a substantial number and, if so, to make the Bill apply only to these. On this amendment he succeeded in taking into the Lobby with him 53 members. Owing to the numerous amendments still remaining to be disposed of, the Prime Minister moved the suspension of the 11 o'clock rule

and the House continued to sit through a great part of the night.

The discussion on January 19 turned chiefly upon the question of conscientious objectors. Mr. Joynson-Hicks denounced the provision made by the Government for the conscientious objectors as the "Slackers' Charter," and demanded that the classification should be limited to those who had been members of the Society of Friends on August 15 last. Mr. Bonar Law admitted that, logically, the conscientious objector ought to be ignored; but that, he said, was impossible in practice, and the Government could not take account of the conscientious objectors of one religious denomination alone. In order to meet various amendments they propose to authorise the Tribunals, in considering applications for exemption from combatant service, to take into account the question whether the applicants were engaged in any work of national importance.

This, however, did not satisfy Mr. Edmund Harvey who represented the extreme Quaker position and declared that conscientious objectors did not want forced upon them anything in the nature of alternative compulsory service, as they felt that compulsion would take away the grace of work which hitherto they had been doing voluntarily. Mr. Harvey's views, however, found very little support in the House of Commons; and at all times, both in the House and in the country, conscientious objectors found very little support from public opinion. Mr. Charles Craig and others went so far as to express the view that the conscientious clause largely destroyed the value of the Bill. Mr. Bonar Law, however, appealed to Mr. Joynson-Hicks to withdraw his amendment, and this was ultimately done. A further amendment was moved by Mr. Snowden seeking to make conclusive a declaration of conscientious objection before two Justices of the Peace. He said there were tens of thousands of men who intended to oppose the measure even after it became law, and he referred to one organisation alone which contained 10,000 members, all of military age, who were pledged to resist it to the utmost. This amendment was supported by 37 members in the division.

The end of the Committee stage was reached on January 20. On that day the only amendment of any importance was one moved by Colonel Yate who desired to include the clergy within the scope of the Bill. He stated that all the clergy in France performed military service and expressed the opinion that clergy taking part in the war, whether as combatants or not, would come back better ministers. The amendment was warmly supported by Mr. Snowden who considered that the clergy were the very last people who ought to be exempted from military service, because no class in the community were so anxious to engage in combatant duties. Even Mr. Bonar Law admitted that there was much to be said in favour of the amendment, and that in other countries they were not exempted from active

service. Nevertheless, he thought that the conditions in this country were somewhat different in this respect from those on the Continent, and ultimately the amendment was withdrawn.

The discussion on the third reading took place on January 24, when the breakdown of all opposition to the Bill became even more striking than had been anticipated. Some anxiety was again expressed lest the provisions of the Bill should be used for what was called industrial conscription, and assurances were again given on behalf of the Government that the measure would not be used to apply compulsion to civil occupations. Mr. Mildmay warned the opponents of the Bill that every vote given against the third reading would contribute a little more help to Germany, and that our soldiers at the front were looking for encouragement and support to the passing of the measure. Sir John Simon repeated his objection to the Bill, and caused some disappointment by refusing to advise his friends not to divide against the third reading. Mr. Thomas, on behalf of the railwaymen, again made a powerful protest against the Bill, which was respectfully listened to by the House. Finally, Mr. Bonar Law closed the discussion by asking opponents of the measure to consider what would become of their ideals if we failed to beat the Germans. Nevertheless, a division was insisted upon, and the third reading was carried by 383 votes against 36, the minority consisting of thirty Liberals, five Labour men and one Independent Nationalist.

Easily as the Military Service Bill had passed through the House of Commons, its career in the House of Lords was even less troubled. The second reading was moved by Lord Lansdowne on January 25. He commended it to the House from a unanimous Cabinet, and an almost unanimous House of Commons. The criticism of the Peers was directed rather against the mildness of the Bill than against its stringency. Lord Midleton described it as another example of the disposition of the Government to take the line of least resistance. He wished that Ministers had shown a little more courage and had spread the net of the Bill a little wider, and especially that they had included Ireland within its provisions. The only objection made to the principle of the Bill was by Lord Weardale, who endeavoured to show that the figure of Lord Derby's residue of unattested single men did not exceed 100,000.

This allegation was, however, immediately challenged by Lord Derby himself, who protested that his figure of 650,000 was a conservative estimate. He confessed that he thought that the chief danger to the Bill came from the numerous exemptions promised by the Government rather than from any inadequacy on the part of the Tribunals. As evidence of this statement he pointed to the fact that no less than four lists of reserved occupations had been published by the Government since he had produced his report, and no fewer than 100,000 badges had been issued in four days of the previous week. He warned the

Government Departments to be on their guard in this matter. After Lord Haldane and Lord Curzon had spoken on behalf of the Bill, the second reading was carried without a division. No other points of interest arose, either in the Committee stage or on the third reading, which was carried on the following day. At length, on January 27, the Royal assent was given to the Bill, which had passed through its various stages in both Houses with a most astonishing degree of unanimity, notwithstanding that it constituted one of the most remarkable revolutions in British public sentiment that had occurred for very many years past.

It is true that this innovation was not carried without the display of some opposition in the country. On January 25 a Conference of the Labour Party, was held at Bristol to consider the principle of the question. Mr. W. C. Anderson, M.P., who acted as Chairman, correctly gave vent to the true motive of the opposition by dwelling on the danger lest the provisions of the Military Service Act should be used for the promotion of industrial conscription. It was perfectly clear, at all events, that the opposition to the Act did not arise from any doubt as to the justice of the war, or from any weakness in supporting the most suitable measures for carrying it on. A resolution was moved by Mr. J. Sexton, of the National Union of Dock Labourers, declaring that the action of Great Britain was fully justified in the present war, and pledging the Conference to assist the Government as far as possible in its successful prosecution. This resolution was carried on a card vote by a majority of 900,000. There was a minority of 602,000, who were said to be influenced chiefly by the belief that the resolution, if carried, would commit the Conference to approval of the Military Service Bill and to indifference concerning some of the blunders of the war. Indeed, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., who was one of the chief opponents of the resolution, went so far as to declare that he and his supporters were the most bitterly anti-German of any section of people in this country. The railwaymen and the engineers voted in the minority, though both bodies would have supported a resolution approving of the prosecution of the war to a successful conclusion. The vote of the Miners' Federation, on the other hand, was cast solidly in favour of the resolution, and later in the day it was again used to approve of the action of the Parliamentary Labour Party in co-operating with the other political parties in the recruiting campaign. On this point the only dissentient voices were those of the Independent Labour Party.

On the following day the attitude of the Labour party towards conscription and the Military Service Bill was defined in three separate divisions. Mr. Arthur Henderson declared his belief that the Government pledges had removed the last shred of danger of industrial conscription. He announced that since Lord Derby made up his report more than 100,000 single

men had already enlisted. The Bill was also supported by Mr. Will Thorne and Mr. G. H. Roberts on the ground of expediency. Mr. Smillie for the Miners attacked the measure, and his example was followed by a number of other speakers. It was, indeed, perfectly clear that the sentiments of Labour, as a whole, were opposed to any adoption of compulsion, but it was also clear that they were not prepared to resort to any extreme measures for the prevention of that course. The delegates registered their protest against the adoption of any form of conscription by a card vote which showed a majority of nearly 1,600,000. Their opposition to the Military Service Bill itself they declared by a somewhat smaller, but still emphatic, majority of 1,356,000. Finally, by 649,000 to 614,000 votes they decided against an agitation for the repeal of the Bill in the event of its becoming law, which event, indeed, took place on the following day. The Miners' Federation voted in strength against the Bill and remained neutral on the question of repeal. No further opposition of any importance was expressed in the country, and when the Bill actually came into operation the difficulties of applying it were found to be far less than had been anticipated either by its friends or its enemies.

Returning now to the beginning of the year, the only event in which public opinion was much interested, apart from the progress of the war, was that known as the *Baralong* case. The German Chancellor in December of the previous year had made a speech in the Reichstag accusing the crew of the British warship *Baralong* of having murdered the helpless crew of a German submarine. At the beginning of January a Memorandum was delivered to the American Embassy, in the course of which the German Government specifically formulated charges of murder against the captain and crew of the British auxiliary cruiser *Baralong* on the depositions furnished by six citizens of the United States and by a boy who had enlisted in the British Navy. The gist of the allegations was that after the German submarine had been sunk and the crew taken prisoners, they were immediately shot without any form of trial, and that the captain, who had leaped overboard from the British vessel on to which he had been taken, was fired at and killed in the water. The German Memorandum demanded that the captain and crew of the *Baralong* should be tried for the murder of unarmed and helpless German seamen, and threatened if this expectation was disappointed, "to take serious decision as to retribution for the unpunished crime." Sir Edward Grey replied through the American Ambassador. He stated that the British Government noted with great satisfaction, though with some surprise, the anxiety expressed by the German Government that the principles of civilised warfare should be vindicated, and that due punishment should be meted out to those who deliberately disregarded them. He said that His Majesty's Government would not be inclined unduly

to restrict the scope of any judicial investigation that might be made. He recalled three incidents of German "frightfulness" occurring during the same forty-eight hours in the course of which the *Baralong* sunk the submarine. These three incidents were the sinking of the *Arabic*, the firing on the stranded British submarine on the Danish coast, and the attack on the steamer *Ruel*. In the opinion of the British Government these three incidents might, together with the case of the *Baralong*, be placed before some impartial court for investigation, and he suggested for this purpose a Tribunal composed of officers belonging to the United States Navy. If this were agreed to, he undertook that His Majesty's Government would do all in its power to further the inquiry.

This reply, which was dated December 14, was published only at the beginning of the year, but such an inquiry as that suggested by Sir Edward Grey by no means commended itself to the views of the Germans. A debate took place in the Reichstag on January 15, in which was exhibited a most extraordinary outburst of violent sentiment. The debate was opened by Count Westarp who spoke of the *Baralong* incident as a cowardly murder, described the British note as full of insolence and arrogance, and called it a monument of England's shame. He announced that reprisals had been decided upon, but would not divulge precisely what measures it was intended to take. A fuller account of this debate will be found in the chapter dealing with German history. But it was noticeable that all the speakers in the Reichstag, and all the German newspapers, avoided contact with the real arguments and suggestions made by Sir Edward Grey, and confined themselves to expressions of their feelings by mere scurrilous abuse.

The sinking of the *Persia* and the many other incidents of German methods of waging warfare had gradually been introducing into this country a feeling of hatred for the Germans of a very different character from that which had prevailed at the beginning of the war. This feeling expressed itself in various ways, but more particularly it began to be felt that it would be impossible, after the conclusion of the war, to resume friendly relations with a country which was capable of perpetrating acts of such barbarity as those which had been established by the Bryce Report, and by numerous subsequent examples. Accordingly, a movement commenced, and gradually increased in strength, for the consideration of the question of waging an economic war upon Germany after the war of the trenches should have been concluded. This feeling received its first overt demonstration in the House of Commons on January 10 when Mr. Hewins introduced a motion demanding a consultation of the Government with the Governments of the Dominions "in order to bring the whole economic strength of the Empire into co-operation with our Allies in a policy directed against the enemy." The motion was not limited in its terms to action

which it was desirable to take during the progress of the war; but its discussion was notable for the complete absence of any disagreement between the rival parties which had previously represented the doctrines of Free Trade and Tariff Reform.

In proposing his resolution Mr. Hewins argued that Germany had preceded the physical war by an economic war, and that they were even now making preparations to continue the economic war after the declaration of peace. It was impracticable for us to meet the extension of the German *Zollverein* with a *Zollverein* of the British Empire and the Allies, but an imperial exchange of views would result in discovering the best means of defeating German plans. Steps could at least be taken to prevent the Germans from ever again exploiting the mineral and other resources of the British Empire. He said that we were now in a position to make ourselves the centre of just such a network of commercial treaties as Germany had been weaving for many years, and to make it impossible for that network to be taken up again by our enemies. Nothing would so discourage Germany as the knowledge that the British Empire and the Allies were making joint economic preparations for the future; and if such preparations were to be entered upon the initiative must come from this country.

Mr. Prothero reminded the House that in food-supplies "the British Empire is self-sufficing and in that respect may be independent of enemy and neutral countries alike." Mr. Chaplin pointed out that as 20 per cent. of Germany's exports in 1913 had come to this country and 28 per cent. had gone to the countries of our Allies, we and our friends had a powerful weapon in time of peace against our principal enemy. Various members who had been known as staunch Free Traders strongly supported the resolution, as also did Mr. Runciman, the President of the Board of Trade, who declared that, commercially, Germany was already a defeated nation. He recognised that this country could not at the close of the war permit the outbreak of a fresh economic war on the part of Germany against the Allies. Our people had already done much to capture German trade abroad, and the British Empire had regained and would keep control of its own metal resources. He expressed the view that it ought to be part of our national organisation that we should have within the Empire all the essential industries, if we were to hold our own in the future. Our banks must be a little more adventurous and, indeed, they ought to afford facilities to enable young firms to get upon their feet. We must improve our Patent laws, and our shipping laws must be overhauled to prevent German mariners from taking advantage of our harbour lights without paying harbour dues. He was himself prepared to go further than the Government had yet gone in doing injury to German trade, but he admitted that in most of these matters it would be necessary to seek the

co-operation of the Dominions. The resolution was accordingly carried without a division.

The only other Bill of importance that was discussed in Parliament during the month of January was the Parliamentary Registration Bill, the main purpose of which was to postpone for eight months the compulsory dissolution of the existing House of Commons. It was acknowledged by every speaker that a general election during the present stage of the war was undesirable; although during the second reading in the House of Lords on January 6 it was argued by Lord St. Aldwyn that circumstances might arise which would call for the vote of the country, even in the midst of war. Both he and Viscount Peel took strong objection to the provision in the Bill which was designed to save the Plural Voting Bill from a natural death. Lord Lansdowne, however, expressed his opinion that that measure could not possibly be revived until the war had ended and the Coalition Government was dissolved.

The clause to which Lord St. Aldwyn took objection provided that the life of the Plural Voting Bill should be prolonged for the eight months during which the existence of the present Parliament was to be extended. When the House of Lords went into Committee on the Bill on January 18 he formally moved the omission of this provision. Lord Curzon expressed general agreement with his sentiments. He admitted that the Plural Voting Bill had always been entirely contrary to the wishes of the Unionist Party, but he pointed out that there still existed a large Liberal majority in the House of Commons; and the clause had been inserted by the Government in the Bill with the view of acting with as much fairness as possible to all parties in the House. A discussion on such a matter was irrelevant when other things of so much greater importance were occupying the attention of Parliament. Ultimately, the amendment was negatived and the Bill, having passed through Committee, became law a few days later.

In the course of the month there was manifested on various occasions considerable anxiety as to whether the blockade of Germany was being carried out as efficiently as it might be. Discussion on this subject took place both in the House of Lords and in the House of Commons. On January 13 Lord Sydenham drew the attention of the House of Lords to the cocoa exports from this country to the countries of neutrals during the war. He pointed out that an export of 6,638 tons between August, 1913, and July, 1914, had increased to 30,086 tons between August, 1914, and July, 1915. Our total exports of cocoa in the first sixteen months of the war had been 33,357 tons as against 8,883 tons in the corresponding sixteen months before the war—an average of 2,000 tons a month during the war and 500 tons a month before. Holland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden had taken between them only 1,161 tons of cocoa in 1913 as against 7,581 tons in 1914 and 15,316 tons in 1915 up to December 21.

The Board of Trade returns showed that our exports from Holland had been 984 tons in 1913 and that they had run up to 5,048 tons in 1914. In the eleven months before the war Denmark had imported 2,211 tons and Sweden 1,550 tons. In the corresponding eleven months of the war Denmark had imported 18,701 tons and Sweden 11,120 tons. He could not see why cocoa, an important food and a source of military supply, should not have been made contraband. To these somewhat surprising figures, Lord Lansdowne replied that before the war Hamburg had been an entrepôt for cocoa and that much of the crop from our West African colonies for neutral countries had found its way through that port. Since the war, this traffic had been diverted to Great Britain, and to that extent we had captured German trade, and so we were entitled to congratulate ourselves; but after making allowances for the consumption of neutrals, he admitted the probability that some of the cocoa we were re-exporting was finding its way to the enemy. In July, 1915, cocoa in all its stages of preparation had been added to the restricted list, and that policy had been attended with a fair measure of success. Licences were now issued for exports to neutral manufacturers in quantities not in excess of their ordinary requirements, and guarantees were demanded from them that the cocoa would be consumed in the country to which it was consigned and would not be re-exported. There was an exception in the case of the Netherlands, which would return the raw cocoa to this country in a manufactured state. If we were too stringent, we might prevent neutrals from importing their cocoa through this country, and in that event we should lose such control as our licences gave us over the cocoa supply of neutrals who would procure their imports from overseas. Lord Lansdowne assured the House that the War Trade Department and the Government were gradually strengthening their precautions against the contingency of the enemy procuring cocoa supplies from this country through neutral powers.

A debate of a more general character took place on this subject in the House of Commons on January 26. It was opened by Mr. Shirley Benn who moved a resolution urging the Government to enforce as effective a blockade as possible against Germany. He suggested that three lines of blockade should be declared. One, drawn from the shores of Norway to Scotland, the second across the English Channel, and the third across the Straits of Gibraltar. Everything coming to those lines from or for Germany should be stopped, and the doctrine of continuous voyage should be applied to all other cargoes. The resolution was seconded by Mr. Leslie Scott who recommended that the Order in Council of March, 1915, should be altered into a declaration of blockade of all the enemy ports by all the Allies, accompanied with a stringent application of the doctrine of continuous voyage. All cargo in excess of the normal requirements of neutrals should be regarded as intended for the enemy.

Sir Edward Grey in replying to these speeches took the opportunity of making a declaration intended for neutrals at large. He denied the allegation that the Foreign Office interfered with the enforcement of the blockade by the Navy, and stated that only on three occasions within the last twelve months had the Government itself taken decisions in relation to seized cargoes without consulting the Contraband Committee. He asked what more could be done than was being done in blockading Germany. The Government could not shut off the trade of neutrals nor could it force all cargoes to pass through a British Prize Court. If they had attempted such a course, the war would indeed have been over, but it would have been over because we should have provoked the resentment of the world. No ships were going through to German ports; the Government was discriminating in regard to neutral ships. Enemy trade was being stopped and the doctrine of continuous voyage was being applied. Action had been taken in common by the Allies in this matter since the previous March.

The Foreign Minister then proceeded to direct his remarks more particularly towards the neutral countries. He declared that we could not give up our right to interfere with enemy trade; "that," he said, "we must retain and must press, if the neutrals admit our right to adapt the doctrine applied in the American Civil War to modern conditions. To prevent enemy trade through neutral countries let them make it easy for us to distinguish and discriminate. If, on the other hand, they say that we are not entitled to do that, then I will take that as a departure from neutrality."

Sir Edward Grey added that he did not understand neutrals to take that line, but there were demands in the recent note of the United States which, if they were conceded, would make it absolutely impossible to prevent even contraband goods from going into Germany wholesale through neutral countries. He contrasted the illegal and inhuman interference of Germany with neutral commerce on the seas with our own regular methods, and concluded with a declaration that the whole of our resources, naval, military, and financial, would continue to be used at their maximum strength in the Allied cause.

A debate of similar character took place on the same day in the House of Lords when Lord Devonport asked what precautions were taken to prevent shipments of iron ore arriving at Dutch ports from reaching enemy destinations. That they had reached Germany he was convinced; and he declared that the Order in Council of March, 1915, had done nothing to decrease the traffic. The Duke of Devonshire replied that vessels carrying iron ore could not, under international law, be stopped in neutral waters, and he urged the desirability of keeping secret the precautions that had been taken.

Notwithstanding these explanations, some anxiety was still felt in the country as to the efficiency of the blockade of Ger-

many; and the subject, as we shall see subsequently, was not allowed to drop. No other business of importance was transacted before the prorogation of Parliament, which took place on January 27. The King's speech referred to the fact that for eighteen months the Navy and Army had been engaged in concert with our brave and steadfast Allies in defending our common liberty and the public law of Europe against the unprovoked encroachments of the enemy; and it expressed the determination of the British people at home and overseas to carry our flag to a final and decisive victory. Parliament was then prorogued to Tuesday, February 15.

CHAPTER II.

THE NEW SESSION.

THE first fortnight of February was largely taken up with the discussion of various schemes for economy, which now became the subject of vigorous propaganda throughout the country. On the first day of the month the Committee on Retrenchment in the Public Expenditure issued its third report which recommended the closing of public museums and galleries. It was estimated that the upkeep of the various museums, picture galleries, etc., in the United Kingdom was about 300,000*l.*, whereas the receipts from the public were estimated only at 3,000*l.* On this ground, as also on the ground of releasing men, and of obtaining buildings for Government purposes, it was decided to close the museums and galleries throughout the country with very few exceptions. This decision immediately gave rise to an animated protest from various learned bodies, and discussions were carried on in *The Times* and other newspapers demanding the rescinding of the closing order. The line taken by the objectors, among whom were Lord Morley and Sir Ray Lankester, was that the museums provided very valuable and important educational facilities to the British public, that the advantages derived from their existence were far more than justified by the small expense connected with them, and in fact that the saving effected in this way would be almost a negligible quantity by comparison with the vast figures entailed by the war. The campaign in the newspapers was followed on February 10 by a deputation to Mr. Asquith from the National Art Collection Fund, the Museums Association, the Royal Asiatic Society, the Hellenic Society, the Art Workers Guild and the Imperial Arts League. Mr. Asquith in his reply defended the closing of these institutions as part of a large number of economies in a great variety of directions, which would be disclosed in the estimates shortly to be laid before Parliament. While he held out no hope that the Government would recede from their decision he announced two minor concessions: the popular parts of the Natural History Museum would remain open to the public, and facilities would be given to students to pursue their studies in

other parts of the Museum. In addition to these concessions it was agreed that the Reading Room of the British Museum should remain open. Little as this reply satisfied the Deputation, yet it was all that they were able to effect, and the decision of the Government remained thereafter in operation.

An interesting revival of the shadow of the Free Trade controversy took place early in February in Manchester. The Chamber of Commerce of that city held its annual meeting on February 14 when the chief subject brought before its attention was concerned with a declaration which had been made by its Board of Directors as to the principles to be pursued by British trade policy after the war. The Board had declared that "the Manchester Chamber would require unmistakeable proof of the absolute necessity of a change to a protective policy before agreeing to sacrifice the advantages of a fiscal policy which has been productive of such beneficial results." At the annual meeting of the Chamber the President assured his audience that there was no intention to commit the Chamber for all time, or to close the door to discussion. Nevertheless the meeting refused to accept the Memorandum as an accurate statement of its opinion, and by an overwhelming majority referred it back for reconsideration by the Directors. The President then declared that it would be futile to discuss the other resolutions until it had been ascertained whether the members at large endorsed the view which had been expressed by the meeting. In the course of the following week, a poll was accordingly taken, and the voting showed a majority of 461 against the Memorandum of the Board of Directors. When the Chamber of Commerce resumed its annual meeting on February 22 the President announced that the Board had decided by 25 votes to 2 that they were unable to modify in any material respect their Memorandum on trade after the war, and that as a result 30 out of 33 elected Directors proposed to resign. Measures were accordingly taken for the election of a new Board.

The new session of Parliament was opened on February 15. The King's speech again expressed the determination of the country "to secure reparation for the victims of unprovoked and unjustifiable outrage, and effectual safeguards for all nations against the aggression of a Power which mistakes force for right and expediency for honour." Various subjects were raised on the debate on the address in reply to the King's speech. Mr. Asquith referred in particular to the finance of the war. He said that even if the war had stopped at the end of 1915 our outstanding liabilities had already become so gigantic that they would impose a serious strain on the resources of this country for a generation. His estimate of the previous November that the war was costing us 5,000,000*l.* sterling a day had been nearly realised. There were only two ways of meeting this enormous expenditure—by large additions of taxation, which he foreshadowed in the near future; and by maintaining

our credit. For the latter purpose it was necessary to keep up our productive activity and our exports, to cut down all unnecessary imports and consumption of luxuries, and to reduce expenditure, not only in the Government Departments but in individual households. The Prime Minister then made a brief review of the progress of the Allies in the various theatres of war since the prorogation. He mentioned that an offer of land had been received from France for the cemeteries of our men who had fallen in the war, and stated that the Prince of Wales would be President of a Committee to be formed by this country to assist in the organisation of this scheme after the war. The situation in Mesopotamia, he said, had distinctly improved ; and as regards Europe the outstanding feature had been the increasing co-ordination and concentration of control among the Allied Powers, not only in strategy but also in diplomacy. He estimated the British Armies in the actual theatres of war at about ten times the size of our original Expeditionary Force, not to mention the troops which had been sent from the Dominions.

Mr. Asquith was followed by Mr. Wardle who spoke as Chairman of the Labour Party and assured the House that the working classes were behind the Government in the matter of the war. Various criticisms were made by Sir Mark Sykes who urged in particular that the Cabinet should be reduced to four members, who should have no administrative office but should be charged with the conduct of the war. Captain Amery pressed for a more concentrated control of the British campaigns ; and Sir Frederick Cawley expressed satisfaction that the Chief of the Imperial Staff had now obtained a greater independence of the Secretary-of-State-for-War. In the House of Lords a statement similar to that of Mr. Asquith was made by Lord Kitchener.

On the following day a resolution was agreed to, that till the end of March no public Bills other than Government Bills should be introduced in the House, and then Mr. Joynson-Hicks moved an important amendment at the end of the address, the substance of which was a demand that the Air Service of the country should be placed on a firmer and stronger basis. He criticised somewhat vigorously the arrangements which had been made for the defence of the country against attacks by Zeppelins, and mentioned as an instance that in the raid of January 31 when the Zeppelins came very low in order to find their landmarks, our coast guns had failed to hit them, and for this reason : that they were guns which had served in the Boer War and had been rejected from the defence of London. He then suggested that our aeroplanes on that occasion had not been ready to go up to attack the German airships ; and as a general remedy for this state of affairs he urged the appointment of a Minister of the Air.

These criticisms in Parliament were merely expressive of sentiments which had been widely felt in the country, and

which indeed had already given rise to various changes in the organisation for air defence. Ten days previous to the debate in the House of Commons, *The Times* had stated that Sir Percy Scott was about to relinquish his command of the gunnery defences of London; and during the first half of February the control of this department was gradually transferred from the Admiralty to the War Office. Moreover, there had been published on February 9, a new order of the Home Office providing for a number of fresh restrictions on public and private lighting in many parts of the country, so that there was much evidence that the Government were taking energetic measures to meet the criticisms directed against them.

In his reply to Mr. Joynson-Hicks, Mr. Tennant laid stress on the advantages which were to be expected from these changes of organisation. He claimed indeed that the transfer of air defences from the Admiralty to the War Office and the appointment of a joint naval and military committee to co-ordinate our land and sea defences against air raids were a great reform. He added that Sir Percy Scott was still in his former position and that his services would be transferred from the Admiralty to the War Office when the pending arrangements had been completed. To this defence Mr. Ellis Griffith replied that it could hardly be called a reform to change the name of the Department under which the same experts continued to act.

In the course of the discussion Mr. Balfour admitted that we were behind-hand with flying machines, with men, and with guns; and that that was the reason why we were not doing so well in the air as the Germans, who had had ten years' start of us. A number of other members of the House then expressed their dissatisfaction with what they considered to be the inadequate defence of the Government. Mr. Harmsworth recommended the appointment of a man like Mr. Lloyd George as Minister of the Air, and regretted that the Government were apparently indisposed to form such a Ministry.

In addition to the transference of the defence of London from the Admiralty to the War Office and the taking over of responsibility for dealing with raids, by the Army from the Navy, it was announced that a standing joint Naval and Military Committee was being formed to co-ordinate production. It has already been stated that the new restrictions on lighting had been extended to nearly the whole of England. In addition to this, a system of warning threatened towns of approaching raids had been devised, and the inadequacy in the defence arrangements was stated to be due to lack of material and of men. In view of these statements and of a promise that an opportunity would be given to resume the debate later on, Mr. Joynson-Hicks ultimately withdrew his amendment.

Meanwhile, a new question of public interest began to occupy the attention of the country. The German submarine campaign had undoubtedly been a failure; nevertheless, a certain

proportion of shipping had been destroyed, and owing to the immense demands involved by the necessities of the war, there began to be felt a serious shortage of tonnage which expressed itself in very high freights. At length it became apparent that the Government would have to take action with a view to reducing the imports into this country, and thus releasing tonnage for purposes of a more important or more national character. At the end of January, Mr. Runciman announced in the House of Commons that it was intended to prohibit the importation of a large percentage of the paper pulp and grass for paper-making which was annually brought into this country. A selection of this particular material for reduction was made on account of its extreme bulkiness relatively to its value, and for the same reason it was stated that restrictions upon importation would likewise be placed on a number of other articles including raw tobacco, many building materials, furniture woods and veneers and some fruits. At the same time Mr. Runciman announced the formation of a small Committee to consider the question of the control of mercantile tonnage. This Committee was under the Chairmanship of Lord Curzon, the other members being Lord Faringdon, Mr. Thomas Royden, and Mr. F. W. Lewis.

This announcement was followed about a fortnight later by a proclamation prohibiting the importation of paper-making materials, paper, tobacco, furniture woods, and stone and slate into the United Kingdom after March 1 except under licences given by the Board of Trade. Included under this ban were all periodical publications exceeding sixteen pages in length, unless imported in single copies through the post. On the following day it was stated by Mr. Runciman that the amount of the reduction in the importation of paper had been fixed by the Government at one-third of the amount previously brought into the country. At the same time a Commission was appointed under the Chairmanship of the Right Honourable Sir Thomas Whitaker, M.P., to grant licences for the importation of paper, wood pulp, and other paper-making materials in such quantities as the Board of Trade might permit.

These measures did not suffice to avert an attack upon the Government in the House of Commons on account of its alleged failure to utilise the available merchant tonnage of the country in as economical a way as possible. The question was raised by Mr. Peto in the form of an amendment to the address in reply to the King's speech on February 17. The member for Devizes, as also various other members, accused the War Department of "a wasteful and extravagant use of British ships," and the remedy advocated by these critics was that an expert authority should be set up with full power to requisition and direct the movements of all vessels, and fix and limit remuneration for transport service of all kinds during the war. On the other side, it was urged by Mr. Houston that the increase of freights was due far more to the action of foreign shipowners than of

British, and therefore that more stringent control over British shipping would not affect those who were profiting most by the high freights.

Mr. Runciman replied for the Government on similar lines. He said that a maximum freight, if it was fixed low enough to be of any advantage, would drive to other parts of the world the neutral shipping on which we now depended for our food supplies. He claimed that the amount of tonnage available for the service of the Allies had not been affected by the transfer of British ships to neutral flags. No British ship could go anywhere or trade anywhere without State permission of one kind or another, and all British ships which were running on Government account were "controlled establishments" and working under Blue-book or maximum rates. He agreed with Mr. Houston that it was not the British ships that had been responsible for the abnormal price of British coal in Italy. In the six months from August, 1915, to January, 1916, 54 British vessels and 209 foreign vessels carried coal from Cardiff to Italy; and all these foreign vessels got a higher rate of freight than the British. In the three months ending January 31 last, 18 British vessels, 39 Italian vessels, 35 Greek vessels, and 23 vessels of other nationalities carried coal to Italy from Cardiff; and again in every case the foreign ships received higher freights than the British. With regard to the steps taken to ease the situation created by the scarcity of tonnage, Mr. Runciman said that executive power had been given to the Port and Transit Committee to enable it to clear congested ports when the Local Port Authorities failed to take suitable action. Of the 40,000 dockers who had joined the army, many had been brought back and he hoped that still more would be recalled. Mercantile shipbuilding was now classed as war work.

Later on in the course of the month a Committee was appointed by the Board of Trade to issue licences for the importation of tobacco into the United Kingdom, analogous to the paper commission. The Tobacco Committee was under the Chairmanship of Lord Newton and contained three other members.

Another problem which was warmly agitated during February, both in and out of Parliament, was that of the effectiveness of the blockade of Germany. On February 14 a crowded meeting was held at the Cannon Street Hotel in which a resolution was passed expressing grave alarm at "the enormous quantity of commodities which is reaching the enemy through the North Sea," and calling on the Government "to give our Navy freedom to make a fuller and more effectual use of our sea power in the war." Feeling ran so high at this meeting that the names of Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, Lord Haldane and Mr. Runciman were hissed on being mentioned by the speakers. Lord Devonport was in the chair and placed before the meeting some remarkable figures, designed to show the

immense quantity of importations of all kinds which Germany derived, especially from Norway and Sweden.

The subject was debated in the House of Lords in the last week of February; but before the debate took place it had already become known that the Government had determined to appoint a Minister with Cabinet rank who was to be concerned especially with the whole question of the blockade. The Minister ultimately appointed was Lord Robert Cecil, who, however, still retained his office of Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

The debate in the House of Lords was opened by Lord Sydenham on February 22. He founded his criticism of the Government on the statement that they still adhered to the spirit of the Declaration of London and allowed it to influence the conduct of our warfare at sea. Lord Sydenham was followed by Lord Beresford who said that an effective blockade would have brought the war to an end already, and that the sort of blockade which we had at present was in fact no blockade at all. There had been confusion and contradiction, and under various excuses commodities had passed to the enemy through neutral countries. He urged that the Declaration of London should be finally denounced, that all goods intended for Germany should be treated as absolute contraband, and that the doctrine of continuous voyage should be applied to all contraband. All enemy property in neutral ships should be confiscated. Finally, Lord Beresford demanded a War Council of five Cabinet Ministers with nothing to do but to supervise our campaign with the expert advice of a general staff representing equally the Navy and the Army.

Lord Lansdowne in his reply assured Lord Beresford that the conduct of the war was already in the hands of a small Committee of the Cabinet, and that the discretion of that Committee was not hampered by the interference of civilians. He quoted figures for the purpose of showing that the imports into Holland and the Scandinavian countries were diminishing month by month in response to the measures adopted by the British Government, and that this tendency had been particularly pronounced in the last six months. At the same time, Lord Lansdowne admitted that he was not satisfied that everything was as it should be. They could not hermetically seal all the channels through which supplies might pass to Germany. Traders in neutral countries would resort to every means to enrich themselves. He then announced the impending appointment of a Blockade Minister, and the debate was adjourned until the following day. When it was resumed Lord Crewe claimed that the Government, although not completely successful in depriving Germany of all commodities, had achieved a considerable and growing measure of success in that direction. He doubted whether it would be practicable to abolish immediately the distinction between conditional and absolute contraband, but he

added that he was certain a very large number of additions might be made to the list of absolute contraband.

Meanwhile the House of Commons was engaged once more on questions of finance. On February 21 the House went into Committee of Supply on two new votes of credit, one of 120,000,000*l.* to cover the remainder of the current financial year, and another of 300,000,000*l.* to start the new year beginning on April 1. In introducing these votes of credit the Prime Minister stated that the total votes of credit for 1915-16 would amount to 1,420,000,000*l.* and the total of the votes of credit since the outbreak of the war to 1,782,000,000*l.* On November 10 of the previous year he had estimated that the vote which he then proposed of 400,000,000*l.* would at the rate of 5,000,000*l.* a day be sufficient to carry on the war until the middle of February. The total amount in the form of votes of credit voted by the House up to date was 1,300,000,000*l.* and the total sum issued out of loan to February 19 was 1,198,000,000*l.*, leaving still in hand out of the sums voted by Parliament 102,000,000*l.* That sum was sufficient to carry on the public service to March 10 at the rate of 5,000,000*l.* a day.

After making a deduction for unspent balances of 65,900,000*l.*, he arrived at the figure of 1,132,100,000*l.* as the adjusted expenditure on the war from April 1, 1915 to the end of the previous week. Mr. Asquith gave an analysis of the expenditure, which showed that the daily average had fallen below his estimate of 5,000,000*l.* Fresh liabilities, he said, had been incurred by the Bank of England at the request of the Government in respect of further advances to various Powers which had not yet been paid, but which would in due course be discharged out of the vote of credit. So far it had not been found convenient to repay to the Bank of England any portion of these advances or certain other advances which had been made since he had last spoken. Consequently, for the adjusted period from November 7 to February 19 (105 days), when the war had cost between 4,300,000*l.* and 4,400,000*l.* a day, there was not included any payment in respect of this liability of the Government to the Bank.

The loans to Allied Powers up to November 6, continued Mr. Asquith, had amounted to 98,300,000*l.*, and these had been followed by a further expenditure down to February 19 of 70,600,000*l.*, making a total of 168,900,000*l.* From April 1 to November 6 the aggregate votes of credit came to 743,100,000*l.*, and from November 7 to February 19 to 389,000,000*l.*—grand total, 1,132,100,000*l.* The total figures from November 7 to February 19 gave an average expenditure of just over 3,000,000*l.* a day on the Army, Navy and Munitions accounts. As compared with the period September 12-November 16, that showed an increase of 400,000*l.* a day. The loans to Allied Powers and Dominions had increased from 98,000,000*l.* to 168,000,000*l.*; but

the figure of 423,000,000*l.* mentioned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in that connexion last September would not be exceeded. Continuing to take 5,000,000*l.* a day as the normal cost of the war, the Government would require 105,000,000*l.* to settle up the account of the financial year ending on March 31, but 120,000,000*l.* was being asked for in order to leave a margin. They hoped before the end of the financial year to repay substantial sums to the Bank of England, and they did not know what they would have to pay for American securities.

The Prime Minister then passed to the vote of credit for 300,000,000*l.* for the ensuing financial year, included in the total sum of 420,000,000*l.*, and bringing the votes given during the war to 2,082,000,000*l.* He assured the House that every measure was being taken to ensure economical administration of the vast sums which the House had voted, and the expenditure of the Army, Navy, and Ministry of Munitions was being supervised closely by Committees of business men.

Later in the debate which followed upon this statement of Mr. Asquith's, the Chancellor of the Exchequer declared that he was quite satisfied with the present rate of American exchange, and pointed out that the United Kingdom was still the only open gold country in the world, that the Bank of England had enough gold to meet all the paper currency in circulation, and that with prudence our credit was assured, however long the war might last. Both votes of credit were subsequently agreed to after a short debate, and on the following day the report stage was also carried.

Doubtless these figures were partly responsible for a renewed impetus to the campaign for economy which was now in full operation. The closing of the museums and picture galleries has already been alluded to. On February 24 it was announced that Ministers had decided in future to accept one-quarter of their salaries in the form of five per cent. Exchequer Bonds; and on February 26 was issued the final report of the Committee on Public Retrenchment which contained many suggestions for savings in civil departments of the Government. Chief among these were the recommendation of an eight hour day as the normal minimum of the working day of the Civil Service. The Committee also recommended revising standards of public building construction, that Members of Parliament serving with the Forces should in future cease to receive both their service pay and their civil salaries, that the long vacation should be curtailed, the Circuit and County Court systems reorganised, and a large number of other recommendations of this character. It was also suggested that there should be a reduction in the deliveries of letters on Sundays.

Many of these economies were ultimately effected, but there was a general feeling that the Government were inclined too much to insist upon the duty of economy by individuals, instead of taking radical measures to set their own house in order. The

Civil Service estimates, however, the figures of which were published on February 29, showed that economies had been effected in the Civil Services to the extent of over 3,500,000*l*. These economies were mainly through reductions of expenditure on the Royal Palaces, the buildings of the Houses of Parliament, Art and Science buildings, Revenue buildings and a number of other buildings, both in Great Britain and Ireland. The discussion on these estimates and reductions in the House of Commons will be referred to shortly.

On March 1 a new impetus was bestowed upon the economy movement by a large public meeting held at the Guildhall under the auspices of the National Organising Committee for War Savings. Mr. Asquith was prevented from attending by a cold, but speeches were delivered by Mr. McKenna, Lord Kitchener and Mr. Balfour. A resolution was passed declaring that no sacrifice was too great to ensure victory, and that only by rigid national and personal economy could the material resources of the Empire be made available for the prosecution of the war to a victorious peace. It was thereupon agreed to inaugurate a campaign in favour of war savings by every means open to the Organising Committee. In the course of his speech Mr. McKenna said that if the nation did not economise it would become necessary to take the money by taxation. He insisted that the well-to-do must desist from idle expenditure, consequent on habit, and the less wealthy must postpone until after the war the spending of their exceptional earnings on furniture, clothing and other things which, though not quite luxuries, were not immediately necessary for their maintenance.

Lord Kitchener argued along the same lines. He said that either civilians or soldiers must go short, and named a number of commodities, especially coal, food, etc., in which economy should more particularly be practised. Mr. Balfour followed with the declaration that economy was only one part of the co-ordinated national effort, and that the man or woman who seriously practised it was contributing as directly, and perhaps as usefully, to success in the war as if the man shouldered a rifle or the woman worked in a hospital at the front. The details of the campaign to be inaugurated were then described to the meeting. Considerable criticism was subsequently levelled against the organisers in the Press, on account of the fact that waiting outside the Hall there had been a stream of private carriages, motor-cars and taxi-cabs driven by men who outwardly seemed to be quite fit for military service. It was felt that those who desired to guide the nation into the paths of economy might themselves have considered more carefully whether their example was not likely to be as efficacious as their precepts.

Neither in the country nor in the House of Commons was there any sort of slackening visible in the universal determination to carry on the war to a successful conclusion. The feeling

of the country was very accurately expressed in a debate which arose in the House of Commons on February 28 on the motion for the second reading of the Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Bill. The debate was initiated by Mr. Snowden, the Labour member for Blackburn, who made a speech of greater moderation than had been anticipated. He insisted that what he specially desired was a satisfactory and honourable conclusion of the war, and he expressed his conviction that the nation was united in its belief in the righteousness of our opposition to Germany. He fully admitted that the motive of the British Empire in going into the war was disinterested, that we had never desired war, and that, even now, we only demanded reparation for all the wrongs which had been done by Germany, and guarantees that they would not be repeated. Up to this point no exception was taken to Mr. Snowden's views, but he then went on to affirm that the situation in the field had now become one of stalemate. Both sides, he said, were unconquered and unconquerable. Even a crushing military victory, if it ever came, would only lead to a fresh war later on, and in these circumstances Germany, both in the Reichstag and in its Press, had shown a certain readiness for peace. He demanded that the British Government should state definitely the terms on which it would be willing to negotiate, and he deprecated speeches made by Lord Rosebery and Mr. Runciman to the effect that the British people would continue the war until Germany was utterly ruined and until she was unable in the matter of commercial competition to raise her head again. Mr. Snowden was seconded by Mr. Trevelyan who called upon the Prime Minister to respond to what he regarded as the approaches of the German Chancellor. In point of fact, however, it may be observed that the Chancellor had done no more than intimate his willingness to receive proposals of peace.

Mr. Asquith's reply was very short, and was received with great enthusiasm by the House. He said that Mr. Snowden and Mr. Trevelyan represented neither the House of Commons nor their own constituents, nor the democracy of the country. He criticised Mr. Snowden's statement that the war could not be ended satisfactorily either by stalemate or by checkmate. He pointed out that the German Chancellor wanted proposals of peace from other quarters, but all the belligerents were in the same position. It was shameless and colossal audacity for the Power which had annihilated and devastated Belgium, Serbia and Montenegro to profess that it was not hostile to small nations, and he referred to the German Chancellor's arguments as "transparently hypocritical." Passing on to the question put by the previous speakers as to why the Allies did not state the terms upon which they were willing to make peace, the Prime Minister pointed out that he had already at the Guildhall on November 9, 1914, stated in clear language the precise terms which this country was prepared to accept. "We

shall never sheath the sword," he said, "which we have not lightly drawn, until Belgium, and I will add Serbia, recovers in full measure all and more than all which she has sacrificed; till France is adequately secured against the menace of aggression; till the rights of the smaller nationalities of Europe are placed upon an unassailable foundation, and until the military domination of Prussia is wholly and finally destroyed." The subsequent debate showed that, with one or two exceptions, the House gave Mr. Asquith and the Government unqualified support, and in fact this discussion was not taken very seriously by members of the House.

On February 24 the House discussed a miscellaneous variety of subjects. Considerable surprise had been expressed in many quarters at a statement made by Lord Kitchener to the effect that the construction of anti-aircraft guns had been given priority over other ordnance. Many people inferred that the needs of the Army were being postponed in deference to the popular outcry for the defence of London. This impression was now rectified by Mr. Asquith, who substituted accelerated manufacture for priority and stated that this would not be detrimental to the supply of the forces in the field. The measure would affect only the lighter ordnance with which the Army was already well supplied. He then went on to state that Lord Derby had accepted the Chairmanship of the Naval and Military Air Service Joint Committee. On the motion for the adjournment a number of members called attention to grievances in connexion with the Military Service Act. The Under-Secretary-for-War stated that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred where men had been cajoled into submitting themselves anew for medical examination, they had applied not for a certificate of their previous rejection but for an armlet. He promised to issue public notice at once to make it known that men who could produce proper evidence that they had been medically rejected since August 14 were outside the scope of the Act. There was some evidence that rejection certificates had been sold to others by the persons to whom they were issued, and for that reason they had occasionally been torn up by recruiting authorities when the proper owner of them had been given an armlet in exchange. Mr. Tennant repudiated any practices in the nature of trickery with which the recruiting authorities had been charged.

The question of trade after the war was again being agitated at the end of the month. On February 29 the Chancellor of the Exchequer addressed the Association of Chambers of Commerce and urged the view that for this country trade and victory were not opposed but interdependent. Our position differed, he said, from that of our Allies. Upon us fell the ultimate burden of supply, and this burden could be borne only if our essential trade was maintained in full prosperity. Passing to the future, Mr. McKenna said that we ought never again to let ourselves

be dependent for many essential matters of our own trade on a nation which in peace had planned and prepared for war. It did not follow, though trade might be free, that the help of the Government should not be given to assist our traders. The Government were prepared to assist the development of foreign trade in order to ensure that those rivals who were now our bitterest enemies should not have their former control of foreign trade. We might also have to learn that the policy of Government assistance was necessary to procure the development of master trades and to secure the extension of our influence through neutral countries.

On the following day Mr. Bonar Law made a speech to the same body in the course of which he announced that it was intended to hold a Conference in Paris to consider whether, and how, it was possible to utilise all the economic forces of the Allies in the prosecution of the war. This Conference, which took place during the summer, will be referred to later.

On the last day of February a discussion arose on the subject of the Military Service Act. Opportunity was taken of the third reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill to discuss various difficulties and misunderstandings with regard to the terms of the Act. Sir John Simon opened the debate by complaining that the Local Tribunals had failed to give effect to the Government promise that young men who were the sole support of their mothers should not be sent into the Army; and he declared that, notwithstanding the undertakings of the War Office, excepted men were still being bluffed into attesting. According to Sir John Simon the muddle had arisen out of Mr. Tennant's statement that single young men rejected under the Derby Scheme must be re-examined. He quoted cases in which men's rejection certificates had been torn up by Recruiting Officers, and other cases in which the certificates had not been delivered at all. Other instances of the same character were adduced by Mr. Pringle.

In reply to these criticisms Mr. Tennant admitted that his answer to a previous question upon this subject had been unfortunate. The Recruiting Offices had not kept lists of the rejected since August 14, and for that reason the "Yellow Form" had been sent out indiscriminately to all men of the prescribed qualifications. He added that every endeavour was being made to carry out the suggestion that married men liable to military service should be transferred into reserved occupations to take the place of single men, in order that the latter might be set free for military duties. Assurance was given by Mr. Long that he would do everything in his power to prevent hardship to widowed mothers and the other dependants of single young men.

On March 2 Lord Derby made a statement in the House of Lords with regard to the number of exemptions given by Local Tribunals to attested single men. The charge brought against the Tribunals was that they had given altogether an unneces-

sarily large number of exemptions. Lord Derby said that he had no complaint to make of the work done by the Local Tribunals under the Military Service Act, but he did complain, on the other hand, of the exemptions secured under the protection of stars and badges and reserved occupations. He referred especially to agriculture. In some parts of the country recruiting among agricultural labourers had done extraordinarily well; in other parts it had done extraordinarily badly. He expressed the view that the Government would have to take far stronger measures than they had yet taken if the men who were necessary for the Army were to be obtained. The correct procedure was to take the men wherever possible out of reserved occupations and put women in their place. He submitted two proposals to the Government as a basis for what he called a new arrangement: (1) No single man who had not attained the age of 31 should be allowed to plead for exemption on the ground that he was starred, badged, or in a reserved occupation. (2) All other single men and all married men should not be considered as being in the starred or reserved occupations unless they held their present positions, or positions of a similar character in other firms, before August 15, 1915.

These proposals, Lord Derby continued, would not apply to skilled workers in Munition Works. Ministers were allowing the strength of the Army to be whittled away by a small body of men in the House of Commons, and were taking advantage of every pretence to prevent the country from getting fighting men. It appeared as if they would rather lose the war than win it. Much had been said about the men rejected on medical grounds before August 14 who had since been re-examined, but he informed the House that many of the rejection certificates in support of such cases had nothing written upon them but the word "Rejected"; nothing to show the cause of rejection, and no signature. Further, the Military Authorities knew that these spurious rejection forms were fetching from 2*l.* to 3*l.* a-piece. After criticising Sir John Simon for the part he had taken in defeating the purpose of the Military Service Act, Lord Derby said that if there were still in the Cabinet, as Sir John Simon had alleged, men whose opinions could not be distinguished from his own, that was a cause for serious alarm. He hoped that such conscientious objectors would appeal to their Local Tribunals—their constituents—and he could assure them that the Military Representatives would not object to their being excused from further service. While the pledge of the Prime Minister had been kept in the letter, it would only be kept in the spirit if the Government adopted the substance of his proposals.

Lord Selborne, President of the Board of Agriculture, protested that the food of the people was as important as munitions, and it was inevitable that some unmarried men of military age should be kept for the land. Lord Harris, as a practical agricul-

turist, said he was sorry to hear Lord Selborne's statement, and he did not believe that any unmarried men on a farm could not be replaced by married men or by women. Replying on the whole debate, Lord Lansdowne contended that Lord Selborne had had in mind only foremen when he spoke of indispensable single men on farms. The lists of reserved occupations were portentous, but they had been framed by experts. A Departmental Committee of the Board of Trade was now going through these lists carefully, and all such cases in future would be closely scrutinised. He expressed himself in favour of the policy of substitution; but the prejudice of the farmer against the employment of women would only be overcome when he became convinced that he was going to lose his men. There were now, he understood, 1,600,000 women in the country experienced in industry, who were unemployed. It was impracticable to apply Lord Derby's proposals to any industries summarily and indiscriminately, but the suggestions would be fully considered by a Conference which was in contemplation between the heads of all the Departments concerned.

Lord Derby then warned the House a second time that the later groups under his Scheme, as well as the earlier groups, would give disappointing results. The reduction of the reserved occupations would have to be on a much larger scale than was likely to be proposed by the Board of Trade Committee. The suggestion that single men under 31 should be released, which Lord Selborne had rejected, was the suggestion of the Committee of the Board of Trade. In the course of his speech Lord Derby announced that 130,000 married men had attested since the beginning of the year—a fact which should give cause for congratulation, seeing that there had been no question of the application of compulsion to them.

Meanwhile, the calling up of the Groups under the Derby Scheme was proceeding far more rapidly than had been generally anticipated. The Military Service Act came into operation on March 2, and no time was lost by the Military Authorities in calling up the men over whom they had thus obtained control. A proclamation was posted throughout the country on March 4 calling to the Colours eight Groups of married men, aged from 25 to 32, beginning from April 7. A week later proclamations were printed calling up the remaining Groups of married men of the ages of 33 to 41. But by this time the attested married men had succeeded in starting a considerable agitation in the country. They affirmed that so large a number of single men had been relieved from one cause or another from the duty of military service that, in point of fact, Mr. Asquith's pledge had not been kept in the spirit, notwithstanding the passage of the Military Service Act. Their propaganda, which began with a demand for the "combing out" of single men from reserved occupations, soon passed on to include demands for general compulsion to be applied to the unattested married men who would thus be placed in the

same category as themselves. These demands soon began to gather force in the country, and in deference to the outcry the proclamation calling up the last eight Groups of married men was postponed at the last moment, and, as it subsequently turned out, for a considerable period. On March 1 Mr. Lloyd George stated that the number of exemptions from military service had caused the Government much anxiety, and that steps had been taken, not only to revise the number of starred and badged men, but also to reduce materially the number of reserved occupations.

On March 7 and March 8 important debates took place in the House of Commons on the Navy Estimates. The Estimates were introduced by Mr. Balfour who quoted Mr. Churchill's claim made in the early months of the war, that the Navy was in a condition to maintain the command of the seas, and added that if such a claim could be made then it could be made with increased confidence now, when there was no regular German cruiser in a position to menace British commerce on any of the oceans of the world. He expressed his sense of the value of Mr. Churchill's work as a pioneer of the Air Service of the Navy which had grown tenfold since the outbreak of the war; and without entering into the controversy whether an Air Minister should be appointed, he declared that the Navy would always require an air division of its own. He described the continued developments in this branch of the Navy's work, and said that the difficulty in regard to machines lighter than air was not in constructing them but in housing them. He warmly denied that the present Board of Admiralty had abandoned the shipbuilding programme of the late Board. There had been no change in policy. The types of ship were varied according to the new and pressing necessities of the moment, and the building resources of the country were being used to an unexampled extent to make ships of war and to carry out the necessary repairs for the Fleet. "The result is that, with one exception, the Fleet is far stronger than when war broke out. That exception is armoured cruisers. We have lost some and we have not replaced them, but our superiority is enormous and is uncontested."

Mr. Balfour repeated his assertion as to the increase of the Fleet in a more particular form. "Our ships, our guns, and our ammunition have increased, are increasing, and will increase." There were, however, deficiencies in certain kinds of ships which the Lords of the Admiralty were anxious to make good. Construction was limited by the want of labour, and that would not be supplied until skilled men were brought back from the front, existing skilled labour was diluted, or the men now working in the shipbuilding yards were induced to work more hours. He informed the House that it was not proposed to keep the Naval Division at a greater strength than six battalions, and as there were now more than enough men for

that strength, no further recruiting was required. The health and discipline of the Navy were all that could be desired, and since he had had any knowledge of the subject, the relations between the Admiralty and the Officers were of the most cordial description. The personnel had more than doubled since August, 1914. It was then 140,000, and it was now 300,000, without the Naval Division. In the same period the tonnage of the Navy had increased by over a million tons.

The main criticism upon this statement came from Mr. Churchill, who asserted that the building programmes of the former Board of Admiralty were not being carried out "fully and punctually," and particularly that the dates to which he and Lord Fisher had worked were not being adhered to in the new constructions. He warned his successor against the danger of reckoning upon the present relative weakness of the German Navy. He exhorted the Admiralty to emulate Mr. Lloyd George and adopt energetic measures to get the necessary labour for shipbuilding, and to return with their increased resources to the more enterprising air policy of 1915, and attack the Zeppelin sheds in Germany. Finally, he surprised the House by urging that Lord Fisher should be recalled to the office of First Sea Lord. Mr. Churchill's speech was only moderately well received by the House, and he was somewhat sharply criticised both by Commander Bellairs and Admiral Sir Hedworth Meux.

But the main answer to Mr. Churchill came from Mr. Balfour on the following day. He criticised Mr. Churchill's claim on behalf of the late Board of Admiralty that it had more "energy, speed, push, and drive" than the present Board. He charged his predecessor with having obtained at least some part of his reputation for push and drive by appropriating to the monitors the guns and gun-mountings which had been ordered for the Dreadnoughts, and then, Mr. Balfour continued, he blamed the present Board for not turning out the Dreadnoughts up to date. He had weakened the Grand Fleet and now censured the present Board for the Fleet's weakness. Moreover, the design of the monitors had been hasty, the execution of the design had also been hasty, and these amphibious vessels were now being remodelled. He said that Mr. Churchill by engaging "in the congenial task of showing how well he had done and how ill his successors had done, and in his deliberate desire to suggest doubts, fears, and alarms was really acting against the public interest." The only consolation was that Mr. Churchill had not done so much injury to the public interest as he would have done if his charges had been well founded.

Mr. Balfour's remarks were still more severe when he came to that part of Mr. Churchill's speech in which the late First Lord had advocated the restoration of Lord Fisher. Mr. Balfour pointed out that Mr. Churchill had stated in public and in

private what he thought of Lord Fisher, and had given him a character which was not at all that of a saviour of his country. To that House itself "in what we thought was his farewell speech" he had declared that Lord Fisher as First Sea Lord had not given him as First Lord the guidance and support which he had been entitled to expect. Then he had sought "the opportunity for calm meditation which the Front apparently presents," seemingly sharing the peculiarity of his ancestor, the Duke of Marlborough, that he was most master of himself amidst the din of battle; and he had come back with a clear mind to recommend that Sir Henry Jackson should be dismissed and Lord Fisher put in his place.

Mr. Balfour said that he did not believe Mr. Churchill's statement that Lord Fisher could not be trusted to carry out measures of which he disapproved. Such a failure by a man in Lord Fisher's position would be almost high treason, and he added that if he were Lord Fisher he should regard Mr. Churchill's apology as the deepest insult that could have been offered to him. Lord Fisher had refused to work with Mr. Churchill, and while Mr. Balfour described it as a rather violent supposition to suppose that he himself would remain at the head of the Admiralty if Sir Henry Jackson were removed from the office of First Sea Lord, he declined to believe that, even if he did so remain, he had any merits superior to those of his predecessor which would induce Lord Fisher to behave towards him differently. In any case, he would be contemptible beyond expression if he yielded an inch to Mr. Churchill's demand for the sacrifice of Sir Henry Jackson.

In the course of a brief reply Mr. Churchill deprecated anger and resentment on the Treasury Bench, and declared that if it had not been for his regard for the public interest he could have made his statement of the day before much stronger in form. He repeated his advice to the Government that the driving power of Lord Fisher should be associated with the carrying out of Lord Fisher's programme.

An echo of this controversy was heard in the House of Lords on the following day in the course of a discussion on the air policy of the country. Lord Beresford said he had written to Lord Fisher warning him that he intended to introduce the subject, but Lord Fisher was not present. It was suspected, said Lord Beresford, that Lord Fisher himself by his influence in the Press, "assisted by twenty sandwichmen," was engineering the agitation for his return to the Admiralty. He would stop the mischief caused by Mr. Churchill's "wicked statements" and by the machinations of a "small mind" if he repeated that the honour of the Navy was safe in the hands of Mr. Balfour.

The air debate was opened by Lord Montagu, who urged the Government to set up a Board of Aviation, primarily with the object of restoring to this country its former supremacy in the air at the Front in France and Flanders. The arguments

against the appointment of a Minister of the Air, he said, were similar to those which had been used against the appointment of a Minister of Munitions. He suggested to the Government the motto: "One element, one service." The functions of a Board of Aviation would be those of policy, supply, and construction, and the Department should be constituted of representatives of the Admiralty, the War Office, the Manufacturers, and the General Staff. The time was almost within sight when the Air Service would be more important than the Army or the Navy, and when the greater part of warfare would be in the air. He described it as a scandal, for which the person responsible should be hanged, that while there was an inadequate supply of engines for our air machines, motor cars were still being made in excessive numbers for the Staff Officers. He insisted upon the provision of more powerful aeroplanes, the provision of more powerful anti-aircraft guns, and the construction of airships. It had been tragic to see our shells fired at the Zeppelin over London in September last burst at an extreme range of about 5,000 feet, or 2,000 feet below the Zeppelin. We should be powerful enough in our aerial equipment to attack the manufacturing districts of Germany as the enemy attacked ours.

Lord Haldane, though he suggested that the creation of an Air Ministry would give us three services of the air instead of one and so would add to the present confusion, acquiesced in the criticism of the existing state of things, and declared that we had suffered from too much push and go, too much violent action with too little violent thinking. There was no fear that we should not be able to hold our own in aeroplanes if we used our opportunities; and if we had applied the same science to the construction of Zeppelins as we had applied to the construction of aeroplanes we should by now have made much greater progress in respect of both. We had now to overtake our former neglect of science in this and other means of waging war.

The reply for the Government was made by Lord Lansdowne, who, while he recognised that there were serious shortcomings in our Air Service, thought they should be excused on the ground of the stupendous and wholly unexpected effort which this country had been called upon to make; he reminded the House that, after all, our aerial provision and equipment had extended enormously. It was the intention of the Government that the best guns and the best gunners should be employed in the defence of the country against air raids. He confessed that he found it difficult to think of a separate air policy, for the Air Service must always be ancillary to the Army and Navy Services. Lord Derby's Committee would be constituted of Military and Naval members, it would have power to call in advisory members, and it would have the assistance of the Secretary of the Committee of Imperial Defence. In practice the powers of the Committee would be very great. Other questions of design, production, and distribution could not be dealt with apart from

considerations of general policy which thus would come under the control of the Committee. There could not, however, be any finality in such a matter as this, and he did not exclude the possibility of further developments.

The interest of the country in the question of air defence derived an unexpected emphasis from the result of a bye-election in the East Herts Division, following on the retirement of Sir John Rolleston. The official Unionist candidate was Capt. Brodie Henderson who had been the prospective candidate for over two years, and who, in accordance with the Party truce, had the official support of the local Liberal organisation. He was opposed by Mr. Pemberton Billing who stood as an independent candidate in the interests of "a strong air policy." Although this constituency had been represented in Parliament for a generation by Conservatives, and although Mr. Pemberton Billing had the support of no political party and fought from first to last almost single-handed, yet he achieved a majority over the official candidate which marked the extreme importance attached by the constituents to his propaganda. The result, which was announced on March 10, showed that Mr. Pemberton Billing had polled 4,590 votes against 3,559 of Capt. Henderson, and there can be no doubt that this majority of 1,031 effectually drew the attention of the Government to the popular demand for a more elaborate defence against Zeppelin raids. Mr. Pemberton Billing was not long before he proceeded to press his views in the House of Commons. An opportunity arose for this purpose in the course of the discussion on the Army Estimates which were introduced in the House by Mr. Tennant on March 14.

In introducing these Estimates, Mr. Tennant gave a highly detailed review of the war. His main topics of a controversial character were those of recruiting and the position of married men, pensions for invalided soldiers, and the Air Service. Energetic steps, he said, were being taken to revise the lists of reserved occupations, and the lists of starred men, and to reduce to a minimum the number of unmarried men of military age who had to be kept at home for the manufacture of munitions. The matter was engaging their earnest attention, and Lord Derby, who was very much alive to the situation, was not going to let the married men down. The Under-Secretary announced that in future candidates for Commissions in the Army would be selected from non-commissioned officers and men who had served in the ranks, including Officers Training Corps. He denied that pensions had not been given for diseases contracted through military service, and gave the numbers of pensions granted in cases of tuberculosis, frost-bite, rheumatism, heart disease, and epilepsy so caused. It had now been decided to give four-fifths of the full pension in cases in which men were discharged through diseases which had been aggravated by military service.

Speaking of the air problem, Mr. Tennant said the War

Office regarded the question as one of the first importance, and the best guns and the best gunners would be employed in defending the home bases of our armies, but the provisions for defence depended for success upon secrecy. The supply of anti-aircraft guns was better to-day than ever before. A school had been provided at Shoeburyness where the gunners were being taught to shoot at objects in the air. "We have established an organisation of defence which for London is complete and which for the provinces is approaching completion; and in London we have provided aeroplane landing-places with lights." The supply of aeroplanes was now ahead of the supply of engines and pilots. High-power British engines were now coming forward and this would produce a great improvement in the Service. We were turning out every month as many pilots as we had been able to mobilise from all our resources at the beginning of the war. Towards the close of his speech Mr. Tennant read a message from Sir Douglas Haig informing Parliament that the troops were all in good health and good heart, and confident of victory.

Mr. Tennant's defence of the Air Service of the country furnished Mr. Pemberton Billing with his opportunity. He expressed his confidence that Mr. Tennant had been misinformed as to the adequacy of our defences against air attacks, and he denied Mr. Balfour's statement that the Air Service was suffering from a lack of material. He urged Mr. Balfour to put aside the scruples of the Board of Admiralty and employ all our existing aerial material in raiding the enemy countries. We had ample material, he said, for air raids on a great scale, and we could exterminate the Zeppelins. Though we had a hundred times more air machines and pilots than we had a year ago, and our machines were much more powerful, we were now doing less with them than we did then.

Anxiety was expressed in the course of this debate by various members as to the care of our wounded in Mesopotamia. Mr. Hobhouse suggested that reticence was being carried too far by the Government, and asked if it would not be practicable for Ministers to take Members of Parliament, at least, into their confidence in Committee sittings after the French model, or in secret sessions of the House. The discussion turned also upon the question of pensions for soldiers invalided from the Army, and Mr. Forster, repeating the statement made by Mr. Tennant on this subject, added that the concession would be retrospective in the sense that claims on account of diseases which had been aggravated by military service, even if they had already been rejected, could again be submitted for reconsideration.

The large number of exemptions to single men which had been granted by the Government gave considerable plausibility to the arguments of the attested married men that the Government had not wholly fulfilled their pledge to the effect that the married men should not be called until the resources of the

unmarried had been practically exhausted. Questions on this subject were put to Lord Derby in the House of Lords on March 15. He replied that everything he could do had been done, was being done, and would be done to secure the fulfilment of the pledge that single men should go first. But there had been no pledge that married men would never be called on. The attested married men, he continued, who were willing to serve had a right to ask that the Government should do all they could to get the single men. His own duty was to remain at the War Office as long as he could be of assistance to Lord Kitchener in trying to set this particular aspect of recruiting on the right lines. He said that Lord Selborne's speech to the farmers had increased his difficulties; and if he thought it really represented the considered view of the Government there could be no alternative but to ask them to relieve him of responsibility in the matter. He claimed to have the authority of the Government for seeing that the Prime Minister's pledge to the married recruits was carried out to the fullest extent, but it was imperative that there should be some exceptions and exemptions of single men. The pressing task now was to see that all single men who could be spared from reserved occupations and other industries should be brought into the Army, and he believed that there was a real endeavour on the part of the new Cabinet Committee to meet the situation. The onus ought to be on the single men engaged in industries to prove that they were more usefully employed than they would be in the Army. The only practicable way in which the Government's pledge to the married men could be kept in spirit as well as in letter was by a postponement of the call to the married groups until Lord Kitchener was satisfied that he had all the single men who could fairly be taken from the industries of the country.

Lord Kitchener added a few words to the same effect. He said that owing to extensions of time granted by the Tribunals and to other circumstances it had been found necessary to call up the younger married groups earlier than had been contemplated originally. But even if all the single men affected by the Group System and the Military Service Act had been taken, the married men would also have been required within the next few weeks. The position was an anxious one, and they would not rest satisfied until they had secured all single men who were not indispensable to national interests at home.

Similar statements were made by Mr. Long in the House of Commons. He said that the one weak clause in the Military Service Act was that relating to industrial compulsion. It was too wide and was capable of being abused. It was being watched very carefully in operation, and if the Government found that it was used improperly it would be necessary to amend it. Attention having been called to the waste involved by passing unfit men into the Army, Mr. Long stated that measures were being taken to correct this evil and to prevent its continuance.

The debate in Committee of the House of Commons on the Army Estimates was resumed by Sir John Simon on March 16. He acquitted Lord Derby of any breach of the pledge to the attested married men, but he contended that Lord Derby's report—"a work of wholly fallacious figures"—had misled the attested married men into the belief that there was an immense reservoir of single shirkers which would be tapped before they were called on. Further, they had been perturbed by the way in which the Local Tribunals were carrying out the Government undertakings in regard to the "widow's son," and were beginning to feel that their own difficulties would meet with no greater consideration. He recommended that the Government should send to the Tribunals the statements made by Mr. Asquith and Mr. Long as to the "widow's son," and ask them to conform to those statements and instructions. He warned the Government against increasing the strength of the Army at the cost of the strength of the country.

Mr. Long, replying for the Government, deprecated criticism of Local Tribunals on account of particular decisions until these had been dealt with by the Appeal Tribunals. He would have nothing to do with Sir John Simon's suggestion that he should send extracts of Ministers' speeches to the Local Tribunals; the regulations were sufficient. Sir John Simon spoke as if he had left the Government quite a long time, but there had been no startling change in policy since his resignation. Of course the Government had considered the relation of the size of the Army to the question of production, and they were working to estimates of their own, but the facts and figures could only be made public to the injury of the State. The "combing out" of men of military age from the industries, and the dilution of labour took time, but more could not be done than was being done, and he believed we should have the men for the Army and, at the same time, the men necessary for our industries.

The report stage of the Army Estimates was taken on March 21 and furnished an opportunity to a number of different members to comment on points which still remained matters of controversy. Mr. Ashley complained of injustices done to farmers by the military requisitioning of agricultural implements. Capt. Tryon suggested as the motto to be pursued by the Government: "A stronger Army and a shorter war." Mr. Pringle argued that if the war was to be won by staying power and economic forces, the enlargement of the Army would diminish our chances of success. Mr. Glyn-Jones complained that married men in reserved occupations who had attested voluntarily on the understanding that they would not be called to the colours except on the decision of the Central Tribunal were now being sent into the Army by the Local Tribunals. Mr. Lough suggested that the Government should announce a recruiting policy which would end uncertainty, while Sir John Rees de-

clared that nothing would solve the difficulty but the introduction of universal military service.

It fell to Mr. Long once again to answer these varied criticisms. He repeated that he was not ashamed of the policy or the action of the Government, and he warmly defended the Local Tribunals. He promised to see if the attested married men in reserved occupations could not have their cases dealt with by the Central Tribunal, as they had been led to expect. A Recruiting Conference had been held at the War Office the previous day to consider the first report of the Board of Trade Committee cutting down the list of reserved occupations and deciding that in many such occupations men below a certain age were no longer to be exempted from military service. Further, men who had joined the reserved occupations after August 14, 1915, would not in future enjoy the same position in regard to exemption as those who had joined before that date. It had also been decided that more men could be spared from agriculture than had been allowed for. Mr. Long once again denied that the Government had broken their pledge to the married men. He said that they were doing their best to bring in the unmarried and that was the full extent of their pledge. The report stage of the Army Estimates was then agreed to.

This sitting of the House of Commons was otherwise notable for a statement by Sir Edward Grey to the effect that within the last few weeks Great Britain, France, and Russia had assured Belgium that at the proper time she would be invited to participate in the peace negotiations, that the Allied and guaranteeing Powers would not cease hostilities until Belgium was reinstated in her political and economic independence and largely indemnified for the wrongs she had suffered.

The Military Service Act had now been in operation for over a fortnight, and in various quarters an agitation commenced for the spreading of compulsion to married men. One of the biggest factors in this agitation was perhaps the so-called Northcliffe Press. But a party committed to those views soon began to crystallise in the House of Commons. Each of the two great parties in the House had established among their members War Committees for the purpose of promoting the efficiency of the measures taken for carrying on the war. In this respect the Liberal War Committee was sometimes more advanced even than the Unionist War Committee, and on March 21 the Liberal Committee adopted a resolution of great significance. It ran as follows: "That in view of Lord Kitchener's statement of our military needs, this Committee is of opinion that as the number of single men provided by the Military Service Act is not sufficient to meet the national requirements, the principle of compulsion should be extended to married men, and that such a measure should be accompanied by State provision in respect of certain obligations of enlisted men." A second resolution

demanding a new provision in the Military Service Act which should bring within the purview of that Act all men who might have attained the age of 18 years since August 15, 1915, or who might attain that age during the continuance of the war.

The Unionist War Committee which met on the same day did not commit itself so uncompromisingly to the principle of universal compulsion; it was understood, indeed, that the majority were willing to put pressure on the Government for the attainment of that end, but they were not prepared to consent to a policy which was in opposition to that recommended by their leaders in the Cabinet. In the country at large the demand for universal compulsion came chiefly from the attested married men. They had already succeeded to a great extent in their claim for the "combing out" of single men from reserved industries, but it became clear that the number of single men thus supplied to the Army was not sufficient to postpone by more than a few weeks the call to the attested married men. The latter class, therefore, began to inquire why they should be submitted to the extreme inconvenience of having to give up their businesses and join the Army, while others who had not attested and not shown their patriotism in any way were permitted to continue their avocations without interruption, and to reap the advantage of diminished competition. A bye-election in the Market Harboro' Division of Leicestershire gave the attested married men an opportunity of bringing forward a more direct expression of their views. The Coalition candidate was Mr. Percy A. Harris, and on March 14 Mr. T. Gibson Bowles was adopted as Independent candidate by the Committee of a newly formed Association of attested married men. It was, indeed, well known that Mr. Bowles' main preoccupations were naval rather than military. In a series of very vigorous articles, published in the *Candid Quarterly Review*, he had advocated a strong naval policy, and at the beginning of the war he had taken up the attitude that so far as Great Britain was concerned the war should be a naval war alone, and that the raising of huge armies to fight on the Continent had been a mistake. The progress of the war, however, had induced Mr. Bowles to alter his view, at any rate as to the present applicability of his doctrine; and thus it was that by the middle of March he came to represent the grievances of the attested married men, and in particular to demand, on their behalf, the institution of a system of universal compulsion. The general feeling throughout the country, however, appeared to be one of confidence in the Government. The Government were plainly unwilling at the present moment to introduce compulsion, and the people had no occasion to believe that the Government would refrain from informing them if it should consider such a measure necessary. Accordingly, the result of the polling in the Market Harboro' Division of Leicestershire showed a large majority for Mr. Percy Harris, who was elected by 7,826 votes against 3,711 cast for

Mr. Gibson Bowles. This result was generally considered as a triumph for the Government, but opinions differed as to the extent to which it had been fought on the question of universal military service.

Meanwhile, the question of trade with Germany after the war was under constant consideration. Early in March it was announced that a Conference would shortly be held in Paris with the Allied countries to discuss the question, and some alarm was expressed by Free Trade members lest, as a result of the Conference, the country should find itself committed to a fiscal system not approved by the House of Commons. The Prime Minister, however, gave assurances that the British representatives at the Conference would return from Paris uncommitted on behalf of this country to any specific measures to be taken after the war, and he expressed the hope that no measure would be adopted that would in reality be more harmful to the Allies themselves than to the enemy. On March 10 Lord Selborne, President of the Board of Agriculture, speaking at the London School of Economics, said that after the war the whole attitude of Parliament towards agriculture would have to be changed. The land question must be considered solely from the point of view of the security of the nation and national defence. He drew various morals from the war. He said that we had learnt the immense strength which was gained by a country if it could feed its own people; we had learnt the great value of rural population; we had learnt the anxieties that were caused to a nation at war which had to import a large proportion of essential products from overseas during the war; and he went on to infer that our agricultural laws must be so framed as to obtain the greatest possible national security. The land question would have to be studied afresh in the light of the experience obtained from the war, and the attitude of the State towards agriculture would have to be changed.

But the main propaganda in this direction came from Mr. Hughes, the Prime Minister of Australia, who had lately arrived on a visit to this country. As in the case of Sir Robert Borden the previous year, Mr. Hughes was invited by Mr. Asquith to attend a Cabinet Meeting held on March 9, and on the following day he was sworn of the Privy Council. His first important speech was delivered on March 15 before the British Imperial Council of Commerce, when his chief text was the extent of German influence in British trade and British national life, and the necessity for ruthlessly destroying that influence. "You cannot proceed," he said, "upon the assumption that the economic policy of a nation has no relation to its national policy; the relations between the two are inseparably intimate and complex. This fact is fundamental. To ignore it is not only to invite but to ensure national destruction. For a time the trade of a nation that treats trade as if it had no connexion with the national safety may make great strides, as did ours,

but there comes a day of reckoning to such nations, as it has come to us." On March 17 Mr. Hughes spoke again at a meeting of the Pilgrims' Club, where he took the opportunity of reiterating his belief in the justice of the Allied cause, and referred to the help which Australia had been able to render. He declared that what the Dominion had accomplished would have been impossible but for the fact that Australia recognised compulsory military training to be the corner-stone of their democratic edifice and had adopted that system two years before war broke out. Speaking again at the City Carlton Club on March 20, Mr. Hughes said that not only must the military power of Germany be utterly crushed but the people of the Empire must extirpate—root, branch, and seed—German control and influence in British trade and industry. That task, he said, involved many very complex questions. Our preparations must be begun at once, and he strongly urged that British policy after the war should be authoritatively declared without delay. On March 22 the freedom of the City of London was conferred upon Mr. Hughes. Great enthusiasm had been aroused in the country by his speeches, and on March 23 it was urged in the House of Commons that he should be included among the British delegates to the Paris Economic Conference. This proposal, however, was described by Mr. Lloyd George as a delicate question which it would not be in the interest of this country or of the Dominions to discuss.

Meanwhile, the question of air defence still continued to be agitated from time to time. On March 15 Lord Derby, representing the Inter-Departmental Committee on the Air Service, made a statement in the House of Lords on the work of the Committee, and announced that Lord Montagu had consented to join it at the request of the Prime Minister. He added that he would not hesitate to resign the Chairmanship of the Committee if he found that it interfered with his work at the War Office. Both Lord Derby and Lord Montagu expressed the opinion that the Committee was but the nucleus of a more important development. A full debate took place in the House of Commons on this subject on March 22, in the course of the second reading of the Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill. It was opened by Mr. Joynson-Hicks who urged that the Civic Authorities should be permitted to give warning of an approaching air raid as soon as they themselves became aware of it, whether from the Naval Authorities or from any other source, and that the Naval Officers who first learned of the approach of German air-craft should be authorised to inform the Civic Authorities, without having to communicate with the Admiralty. In consequence of the present clumsy system the warning siren at Ramsgate in the raid of three days previously was not sounded until the German air machines had gone. If the Civic Authorities had been allowed to give warning when they heard the firing in the direction of Dover, the Sunday-

school children who were killed would have been kept at home and their lives saved. Mr. Joynson-Hicks added that he had ground for believing that there was substance in the recent criticisms made in the House by Mr. Bennett-Goldney of the staffs of the air-craft stations on the south-east coast; for in the last raid too many officers were found to be away at lunch at the same time.

Mr. Pemberton Billing made a speech of somewhat more heated character, and criticised the credentials of the members of Lord Derby's Air Service Committee. He described Great Britain as a third-class air Power, and declared that thousands of air machines had been ordered by the Royal Flying Corps which were afterwards referred to at the Front as "Fokker fodder." Quite a number of officers of the Royal Flying Corps had been rather murdered than killed. He knew of thirty air-pilots who were quill-driving instead of machine-driving. The Royal Naval Air Service was at present of no use whatever to the Grand Fleet. While the German Fleet had many eyes in the air, ours was blind. There was no reason whatever why every Zeppelin in Germany should not be blown up within the next six months, and he suggested that an Air Board should be appointed with full administrative powers, under the control of the First Lord of the Admiralty.

The Government reply came from Mr. Tennant, who said that in the first eight or ten months of the war the German airmen hardly dared to come over our lines in Flanders, while our airmen repeatedly crossed theirs. Consequently it was grotesquely absurd and absolutely untrue to speak of this country as a third-class air Power. Mr. Billing had stated what was not true when he alleged that no air raids were carried out by us, and he was singularly ill-informed in his criticism of Sir David Henderson. The Commander-in-Chief in the field was quite satisfied with the Air Service at the Front. In reply to Mr. Joynson-Hicks, Mr. Tennant stated that a system of warnings had been arranged, but it was inadvisable to give the details. He invited Mr. Joynson-Hicks to go with him to the Horse Guards and examine the system, an invitation which was immediately accepted. Mr. Tennant's statement, however, failed to give satisfaction in many parts of the House, and Mr. Ellis Griffith contended that the Air Committee, as it had no power to insist upon its advice being carried out, did not signify any progress. Moreover, he affirmed that Lord Derby could not possibly have the time to perform the duties of the office.

The next important debate on this subject arose on the third reading of the Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill in the House of Commons on March 28. The most important speech of the debate was again made by Mr. Pemberton Billing, who on this occasion carried the House with him to a much greater extent than he had with his previous speech. He would not withdraw

his allegation that some of our airmen had been murdered rather than killed, though he showed that he did not mean, of course, that the victims of faulty engines and groggy aeroplane had been killed and slain feloniously. He submitted to the House a long list of pilots who had perished, as he said through having been sent up in machines which were not fitted for the tasks given them and which had been hopelessly outclassed by the German machines. "Not twenty miles from here," he said, "there are the finest machines the world has ever seen, and yet we are content to go on ordering this aeronautical rubbish in thousands from the Royal Aircraft Factories." He complained that pilots were being driven into the air in the night inadequately armed merely to satisfy public clamour, or to save the official face. He urged that every aeroplane should be fitted with dual control, affirming that in the past many lives would have been saved by such a proceeding. Finally, he demanded an inquiry into the charges which he had brought.

The air member was supported in his criticisms by many other members. Sir W. A. Gelder stated that in a certain town a gun about which the military had solemnly mounted guard night and day had, when the Zeppelins came, been found to be a dummy. Capt. Bennett-Goldney contended that there was too much concealment and make-believe on the part of the Government, and recommended that the Air Service should be placed under one competent and responsible control. In this demand he was supported by a strong speech from Sir Alfred Mond.

In reply to these numerous criticisms, Mr. Tennant announced that he would make it his business to have Mr. Billing's charges investigated by, if possible, a judicial body. He would ask the Prime Minister to set up such a body to go through the charges and report to the House. Mr. Tennant mentioned that his own eldest son was in the Royal Flying Corps, and he certainly had no apprehension that he would be murdered. The hope of the Government of being able to deal with the Zeppelin raids was higher to-day than ever it had been. For the rest, Mr. Tennant assured the House that the matter was engaging the attention of a great number of not really stupid people.

Meanwhile the Defence of the Realm Act was from time to time being strengthened by new regulations. On March 23 an opportunity was taken by Mr. Trevelyan in the House of Commons to open a debate on the administration of the Act. He complained that the Government had unnecessarily prosecuted offenders against the provisions of the Act and had suppressed newspapers for mere indiscretions. He dealt particularly with the case of the daughter of an English squire, a lady of pure English extraction, who was arrested in September, 1915, at her father's house in his absence, her father being kept in

ignorance of her whereabouts for seventeen days. Mr. Trevelyan stated that she was still detained in an internment camp, though no charge had been made against her. A further instance of a similar character was brought forward by Mr. Jowett. The answer to these criticisms was made by the Attorney-General who began by reminding the critics of the Act that the country was at war. He assured them that there was a conclusive answer to all the cases which they had cited, and he gave full details as to the case of the English squire's daughter. He said that by her own admissions she had from 1909 been the intimate friend of a person who had been obliged to flee the country because he had been associated with sedition and attempts at assassination. Towards the beginning of the war this individual had left England and had gone to Berlin, and he had since been employed there as an agent of the enemy. He had visited neutral countries for the purpose of arranging meetings with people from this country, and in May, 1915, the squire's daughter had gone to Switzerland and met this German spy, and the two had stayed in the same hotel for several days. She had then come back to England with a message from the spy to one of his accomplices here, and when she was arrested she had in her possession literature of a seditious character advocating revolution and murder.

The operations of the war formed the subject of a debate in the House of Lords on March 30, for it was still the case that criticism against the action of the Government was more free in the Upper than in the Lower House. In the present case Lord Beresford raised the question of responsibility for the Mesopotamian operations by asking whether the General Officer commanding the British forces besieged at Kut-el-Amara had recommended the advance on Ctesiphon. He declared that General Townshend ought never to have been committed to the advance on Bagdad with less than three divisions, whereas in point of fact he had gone with less than one. His line of communications was 380 miles long, and the worst line of communications possible in war time, for it was a river. Very few light draught boats had been provided, though it was known that the river was shallow. He said that the whole of these auxiliary campaigns had been gambles, and asked why no despatches from Mesopotamia had been published during the last year. Finally, he stated that he had had some time ago addressed a letter to the Prime Minister giving advice which if it had been followed would have prevented the loss of the *Lusitania* and of the battleships which had been sunk in the Dardanelles.

To these charges Lord Islington made a brief reply on behalf of the Government. He said that any recommendation which General Townshend had made before his attempted advance on Ctesiphon would have been addressed to the General Officer commanding in Mesopotamia, Sir John Nixon, and no such

representation had been reported to the Government. The advance had been authorised by the Government on the advice of the General Officer commanding in Mesopotamia and the Government of India. At the proper time the Government would be prepared to face the closest examination on all that had taken place in Mesopotamia. Lord Midleton pressed further for the publication of dispatches, and Lord Crewe replied that it would be considered how far the public interest would allow of such publication. He added that no naval or military commander had been asked by the civil power to undertake operations with a force which he had declared to be inadequate for the purpose.

It has been said that the compulsory measures of the Military Service Act and the Munitions Act were received in the country with far less opposition than had been anticipated, either by the friends or by the foes of these measures. Nevertheless, it cannot be recorded that there was no opposition of any kind. At the end of March and the beginning of April various strikes were organised in some of the most important Munition Works in the area of the Clyde. A body calling itself the Clyde Workers' Committee, but in point of fact identical with the body previously known as the Clyde Labour Withdrawal Committee, was endeavouring to organise these strikes for the express purpose of holding up the production of war supplies, and thus compelling the Government to repeal the Military Service Act and the Munitions of War Act. The matter was brought to a crisis at the end of March by the arrest of six of the ringleaders of this body. An account of this action was given to the House of Commons on March 28 by Dr. Addison, the Secretary of the Ministry of Munitions. He said that though the measures taken by the Ministry of Munitions to secure dilution of labour in the Clyde District had been acquiesced in by the local Trade Union leaders, this new body had nevertheless been formed for the purpose of obstructing the Acts in every way that they could. A series of strikes had been organised for this purpose which had not been ended by repudiation of the strike and the strikers by the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. Accordingly, the Ministry of Munitions had felt it necessary to take action under Section 14 of the Defence of the Realm Regulations and request the Military Authorities to remove six of the ringleaders. Sir Edward Carson immediately suggested that these men had been guilty of high treason, and various other members urged that they should be brought to trial. Dr. Addison replied that the whole matter was being carefully considered, and in the meantime the men would have the choice of remaining in one of certain other areas than the Clyde.

This action on the part of the Government, although it gave rise to protest, was comparatively successful in leading to a termination of the troubles. A meeting of the Clyde Workers' Committee was held to protest against the deportation of their

members who had been arrested, but the Executive Council of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers acted with the Government and instructed their District Secretary that members of the Society should not leave work in order to be present at the meeting. Three further arrests were made in Glasgow under the instructions of the Ministry of Munitions, and the men arrested were dealt with in the same way as the other six, who had all been conveyed to the East coast. The specific allegation against them was that of having delayed the production of munitions in one of the local controlled establishments; and they were required to remain at a specified distance from Glasgow so long as the Authorities might consider this necessary. Throughout the month of March, Government Commissioners were in Glasgow paying special attention to the situation existing on Clydeside, and these Commissioners succeeded in retaining close touch with the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. On March 30 Mr. Lloyd George made a statement in the House of Commons describing the origin of the strike. He said it was untrue that it had arisen from the withdrawal of privileges formerly enjoyed by shop stewards. The workmen had claimed that the stewards should be allowed to interrupt their own work in order to go into other departments and enquire into the operation of the arrangements for the dilution of labour. The employers had objected to this demand but had offered to submit it to the Clyde Commissioners. This offer had been declined by the men who notwithstanding that they were engaged on urgent national work had forthwith gone on strike. The employers had been willing to give reasonable facilities to the men's representatives to ascertain what was being done under the dilution scheme. Against this statement of Mr. Lloyd George, it was suggested by Mr. Hogge that only one side of the case had been presented to the House, but Mr. Lloyd George retorted that if there had been another side the men would have presented it before the Clyde Commissioners. He said that every bargain made by the men with the Ministry of Munitions and with the Prime Minister himself had been broken. Further criticism of the Ministry of Munitions came from Mr. Pringle who alleged that in a particular instance negotiations had been broken off by the Ministry of Munitions when prospects of a settlement were extremely good. Mr. Lloyd George denied that there was any truth in this allegation, though he admitted that Dr. Addison, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Munitions, had been approached but had refused to have anything to do with men who at that moment were defying the law. He had told them that the first thing they had to do was to return to work. Dr. Addison himself then stated that the suggestions which had been made to him by the members of the Clyde Workers' Committee had been impracticable, and he had informed his visitors that the Government could make no conditions. Mr. Lloyd George again declared that there had

been nothing in the nature of negotiations, and that the Workers' Committee was an organisation to foment sedition against the Government, against order, and against Trade Unionism itself. He announced further that Mr. Arthur Henderson was proceeding to Glasgow to inform the Trade Unions, whose leaders had been perfectly loyal, of the whole circumstances. But already the bitterness of the dispute was beginning to subside, for on March 30, 363 men returned to work, and by April 4 the strike was practically at an end. The factors which were chiefly instrumental in bringing about this fortunate conclusion were the firm action and attitude of the Authorities throughout, supported by the decided repudiation of the strike by the Executive of the Amalgamated Society.

During the first six months of the year one of the most striking features of allied policy in regard to the war was the gradually increasing co-operation between the various countries of the Allies, and their effort to establish a common policy. This movement culminated on March 27 in an important Conference in Paris, which was held for the discussion not only of economic questions but also of military matters, and especially questions relating to arms and ammunition. The British representatives were Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Kitchener, and General Sir William Robertson; and the nations represented at the Conference included not only Great Britain and France, but also Russia with two members, Serbia with four members, Belgium with three members, Italy with five members, and Portugal and Japan with one member each. The Conference continued for two days, at the end of which M. Briand thanked the representatives of the Allied Powers for their invaluable help and congratulated himself on the ease with which the different questions discussed had been settled. He added that if new questions involving joint discussion were to arise it was certain that the Allied Governments would consider that the best way to settle them would be to meet again. No public statement was made as to the detailed conclusions attained by the Conference, but satisfaction was expressed on all sides as to its results, especially with regard to economic matters. The joint discussion of policy on this latter point prepared the way for the important economic Conference which was to be held in Paris a few weeks later.

During the month of April the agitation for a more stringent application of the blockade to Germany was temporarily quiescent. The discussion of the subject during the previous month, however, had not been without fruit, for on April 5 Lord Robert Cecil announced that in order to mark the practical identity of absolute contraband and conditional contraband in respect of the doctrine of continuous voyage, the Government proposed to issue a complete list of all contrabands absolute and conditional, so that neutral traders should have notice of the position. The list of contrabands had been extended from time to time, and it

was proposed to add certain articles almost immediately. These proposals were forthwith carried into effect.

Discontent with the Government was perhaps becoming now more general than it had been for some time past. The main-spring of this sentiment was undoubtedly the delay and hesitation displayed by the Cabinet on the question of the introduction of compulsory military service. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that even when criticism was running at its strongest the country was at all times ready to give overwhelming support to the Government, if for no other reason, at least because no alternative Government was conceivable. The support of the House of Commons was shown rather unexpectedly in a debate raised by Sir Frederick Banbury on April 6 on the subject of the salaries of Members. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had moved that a Member of Parliament employed in the naval or military forces should be obliged to decide whether he would take his salary as a Member or as a soldier or sailor, whereupon Sir Frederick Banbury moved an amendment to the effect that all salaries of Members of Parliament should be stopped. The amendment was warmly denounced by Mr. Duke who described it as a breach of the party truce, and declared that a man who had 10,000*l.* a year and wished to deprive a Labour Member of of his 400*l.* a year was not playing the game. Mr. Bonar Law expressed his agreement with Mr. Duke, and said the question was as much one of Party controversy as Home Rule or Welsh Disestablishment. The amendment was also deprecated by Sir Edward Carson and was finally rejected by 247 votes to 32.

There can be no greater proof of the determination of the country to prosecute the war at any cost to a successful conclusion than the reception accorded to the Budget which was introduced by Mr. McKenna into the House of Commons on April 4. He began his account of the estimated revenue with a loyal allusion to the gift of 100,000*l.* which the King had recently made to the nation. He estimated the net revenue at 502,000,000*l.* The estimated expenditure was 1,825,000,000*l.*, so that the estimated deficit was 1,323,000,000*l.* That would have to be made good by borrowing, and reckoning interest at 5 per cent. and Sinking Fund at 1 per cent. he had to meet a new charge for interest and Sinking Fund amounting to 79,000,000*l.*

He proposed an addition to the Income Tax which would rise by 1*s.* 6*d.*, making the maximum rate of tax 5*s.* in the pound. Earned incomes up to 500*l.* a year would in future pay 2*s.* 3*d.* in the pound instead of 2*s.* 1½*d.* as at present. For earned incomes between 500*l.* and 1,000*l.* the rate would be 2*s.* 6*d.*, and the tax would be carried up to 5*s.* by successive stages, the maximum to be paid on earned incomes exceeding 2,500*l.* a year. On unearned incomes the new scale would begin at 3*s.* on incomes not exceeding 300*l.*, and would rise by stages to 5*s.* on incomes exceeding 2,000*l.* On unearned incomes the nominal rate through-

out would be 5s. in the pound, and that would be the rate collected at the source. These increases were expected to produce 43,500,000*l.* He did not propose any change in the rate of super-tax.

Mr. McKenna's proposals under the head of Customs and Excise were estimated to bring in a revenue of 21,800,000*l.*, not allowing for forestallments. The third proposal was for a tax on entrance fees charged for amusements, theatres, cinemas, football matches, and horse races, and he expected from this source a revenue of 5,000,000*l.* This proposal was most warmly welcomed by the House. From a tax on railway tickets the Chancellor estimated that he would receive 3,000,000*l.*, a proposal which appeared to give less satisfaction to the House. The price of sugar in this country being lower than it was in New York, it was proposed to add $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* to the sugar tax, and 7,000,000*l.* was expected from this source. Cocoa, coffee, and chicory were to pay higher duties, the tax on cocoa being increased from 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* to 6*d.* a pound, and the tax on coffee and chicory from 3*d.* to 6*d.*, a change which was expected to yield 2,000,000*l.* A tax was proposed on matches which would add 2,000,000*l.* to the revenue; another 2,000,000*l.* were to be obtained from taxes on mineral waters, cyder, and perry.

Increased duties were to be placed on motor cars and motor bicycles, which were estimated to bring in 800,000*l.* For 1916-17 the total revenue from these taxes would be 21,450,000*l.*, and adding the 43,500,000*l.* from the Income Tax additions, the additional revenue from his proposals, so far, would be practically 65,000,000*l.* But the difference between the true revenues of the two years was 93,000,000*l.*, for in the case of nearly all of the new taxes the previous year there had been a run of only six months. The Excess Profits Tax was to be increased from 50 per cent. to 60 per cent., and this and the munitions levy on controlled establishments were expected to give 86,000,000*l.* A decline in the revenue of 5,000,000*l.* from beer and spirits was allowed for, and if the taking over of distilleries by the Ministry of Munitions should lead to an increased charge for spirits, Mr. McKenna promised that the increase should be absorbed for the public benefit by way of taxation.

Forecasting the position at the end of 1916-17, Mr. McKenna said our permanent revenue (leaving out the temporary yield of the Excess Profits Tax) would then be 423,000,000*l.*, our total indebtedness 3,440,000,000*l.*, of which 800,000,000*l.* would be attributable to advances to Allies and Dominions, leaving our net debt at 2,640,000,000*l.*, and the debt charge, allowing for a substantial Sinking Fund, 145,000,000*l.* He estimated that our annual post-war expenditure would be 338,000,000*l.*, leaving a surplus on the basis of peace expenditure, after another year of war, of 85,000,000*l.* By way of comparison he stated that we were raising in the present year over 300,000,000*l.* by new taxation imposed since the war, whereas Dr. Helfferich

in Germany had only announced a doubtful increase of 24,000,000*l.*

The new taxes may be summarised as follows :—

Tax ranging from $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* to 1*s.* on admission tickets for theatres, cinema houses, football matches, and horse races.

Tax ranging from 1*d.* upwards on railway tickets costing more than 9*d.*

Tax of 4*d.* per thousand on household matches.

Tax of 4*d.* a gallon on table waters prepared with sugar and fermented; 8*d.* on all others; 4*d.* on cyder and perry.

The effect of the increase of the old taxes was as follows :—

Income Tax, earned: new rate 2*s.* 3*d.* to 5*s.* in the pound, as against 2*s.* 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* to 3*s.* 6*d.* Unearned: 3*s.* to 5*s.*, as against 2*s.* 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ *d.* to 3*s.* 6*d.* Tax of soldiers' and sailors' pay and Super-tax unchanged.

Taxpayers on the quarterly instalment plan might, if they wished, pay weekly by means of stamped Income Tax cards.

Motor cars up to 16 h.p., licence duty doubled; over 16 h.p., duty trebled.

Motor cycles up to 4 h.p., 2 guineas; above that three-quarters of the duty on a car of the same power. Previous to this proposal the duty had been 1*l.* on all motor cycles.

Sugar: increased tax of $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* a pound.

Cocoa tax raised from 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* to 6*d.*

Coffee and chicory tax raised from 3*d.* to 6*d.*

Excess Profits Duty raised from 50 per cent. to 60 per cent.

The following table shows the estimated revenue for 1916-17, as compared with the receipts for 1915-16 :—

	Estimate for 1916-17 on basis of existing Taxation.	Receipts in 1915-16.
	£	£
Customs - - - - -	61,250,000	59,808,000
Excise - - - - -	53,300,000	61,210,000
Estate, etc., Duties - - - - -	30,000,000	31,035,000
Stamps - - - - -	7,000,000	6,764,000
Land Tax - - - - -	660,000	660,000
House Duty - - - - -	1,990,000	1,990,000
Income Tax (including Super-tax) - - - - -	151,500,000	123,820,000
Excess Profits Duty - - - - -	75,000,000	140,000
Land Value Duties - - - - -	475,000	363,000
Postal Service - - - - -	26,000,000	24,100,000
Telegraph Service - - - - -	3,250,000	3,350,000
Telephone Service - - - - -	6,850,000	6,450,000
Crown Lands - - - - -	550,000	550,000
Suez Canal Shares and Sundry Loans - - - - -	5,000,000	2,432,000
Miscellaneous - - - - -	3,500,000	9,797,000
Total - - - - -	£426,325,000	£336,767,000
Borrowings to meet Expenditure chargeable against Capital - - - - -	1,390,000	2,569,000

The following table shows the estimated expenditure, 1916-17, compared with the issues of 1915-16 :—

	Estimate for 1916-17.	Exchequer Issue, 1915-16.
	£	£
National Debt Services :—		
Inside the Fixed Debt Charge - - - -	12,818,000	20,388,000
Outside the Fixed Debt Charge - - - -	81,936,000*	39,911,000
Road Improvement Fund - - - - -	—	694,000
Payments to Local Taxation Accounts, etc. - - - -	9,500,000	9,767,000
Other Consolidated Fund Services - - - - -	1,700,000	2,788,000
Army (including Ordnance Factories) - - - -	15,000†	15,000
Navy - - - - -	17,000†	17,000
Ministry of Munitions (including Ordnance Factories) - - - -	1,000†	2,000
Civil Services - - - - -	55,515,000	54,718,000
Customs and Excise and Inland Revenue - - - -	4,841,000	4,603,000
Post Office Services - - - - -	26,537,000	26,673,000
Votes of Credit - - - - -	300,000,000	1,399,652,000
Total - - - - -	£492,880,000	£1,559,158,000

The Final Balance Sheet, 1916-17, as proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was as follows :—

Revenue.		Expenditure.	
	£		£
Customs - - - - -	61,250,000	National Debt Services :—	
Proposed additional taxation - - - - -	9,750,000	Inside the Fixed Debt Charge - - - -	12,818,000
Excise - - - - -	53,300,000	Outside the Fixed Debt charge :—	
Proposed additional taxation - - - - -	11,700,000	£81,936,000	
Estate, etc., Duties - - - - -	30,000,000	Interest and Expenses of Additional War Debt :—	
Stamps - - - - -	7,000,000	£32,500,000	114,436,000
Land Tax - - - - -	660,000	Payments to Local Taxation Accounts, etc. - - - -	9,500,000
House Duty - - - - -	1,990,000	Other Consolidated Fund Services - - - - -	1,700,000
Income Tax (including Super-tax) - - - - -	151,500,000	Army - - - - -	15,000
Proposed additional taxation - - - - -	43,500,000	Navy - - - - -	17,000
Excess Profits Duty - - - - -	75,000,000	Ministry of Munitions (including Ordnance Factories) - - - -	1,000
Proposed additional taxation - - - - -	11,000,000	Civil Services - - - - -	55,515,000
Land Value Duties - - - - -	475,000	Customs and Excise and Inland Revenue - - - -	4,841,000
Postal Service - - - - -	26,000,000	Post Office Services - - - - -	26,537,000
Telegraph Service - - - - -	3,250,000	Vote of Credit :—	
Telephone Service - - - - -	6,850,000	£300,000,000	
Crown Lands - - - - -	550,000	Further Votes of Credit	
Receipts from Suez Canal Shares and Sundry Loans - - - - -	5,000,000	£1,300,000,000	1,600,000,000
Miscellaneous - - - - -	3,500,000	Total - - - - -	1,825,380,000
Total - - - - -	£502,275,000	Borrowings to meet Expenditure chargeable against Capital - - - - -	
Deficit - - - - -	£1,323,105,000	1,390,000	
	£1,825,380,000		
		Expenditure chargeable against Capital - - - - -	1,390,000

* On War Debt created up to March 31, 1916.

† Nominal provision, the substantive provision being made under votes of credit.

Mr. McKenna's Budget was remarkable not only on account of the fact that it was the most gigantic Budget ever brought into the House of Commons in the history of the country, but also from the fact that it was received with almost universal consent, exception being taken only to one or two minor features by different small groups of Members.

It was generally considered that a colossal problem had been handled in a way which was financially sound and approximately just to all classes of the people. The only tax to which any serious objection was taken from the first was the proposed duty on railway tickets, which found no friends in any Party and was opposed with particular vehemence by the Labour Members. It was pointed out that cheap excursions had already been abolished; that the railways were little used for the purpose of pleasure, and that the new tax, therefore, would fall in the main on those who travelled for business. It followed that the Railway Tax was an indirect charge on trade, and in the case of many commercial travellers a direct charge on their means of livelihood. Accordingly, strong representations were made to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in favour of the withdrawal of the proposal.

When the debate was resumed on April 5, Mr. Hewins referred to the measures taken for checking the importation of luxuries. He condemned the choice of prohibition in preference to taxation, arguing that prohibition, itself an extreme form of tariffs, would lead to intolerable tariffs after the war. He regarded the Budget as an intimation to the Allies that the Government did not mean to do anything at all at the Economic Conference in May. Yet that Conference might be one of the great landmarks in history. Many other speakers deprecated the Railway Tax as being likely to discourage commerce. Sir Alfred Mond warmly praised the Chancellor of the Exchequer's programme, and contrasted its finance triumphantly with that of Germany. Mr. Bryce and Sir George Reid pointed out that this country was losing rather than gaining by continuing to enforce double Income Tax upon Colonial concerns in the United Kingdom.

Mr. McKenna promised to reply later to his critics; and the resolutions necessary for the introduction of the Finance (New Duties) Bill were reported to the House, it being explained that if the new taxes were got through quickly the Exchequer would be saved 3,000,000*l.* The Bill was thereupon introduced by Mr. McKenna.

The second reading was taken on April 10, when Mr. T. P. O'Connor and Mr. Arthur Stanley made a combined attack on the duty on matches, pointing out that the industry had already suffered severely from the existence of the war, and that its very existence was threatened by foreign competition. Mr. Lough held that there was no need for any of the new taxes. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Rowlands directed attention to the hardships

which would arise from the tax on railway travelling, and Major Newman said it would press hardly on soldiers and young officers travelling long distances on furlough. Mr. Duke hoped that the case of commercial travellers would receive special consideration.

Mr. Montagu in reply said that all the suggestions with regard to the travelling tax would be carefully considered in Committee. Something might be done to meet the criticisms by exempting commercial travellers from the tax, and yet something more by giving up the tax altogether. "But," he continued, "there are serious objections to the courses which have been advocated as well as obvious advantages, and the tax, as I think, is a good way of obtaining the revenue we require." After some further discussion the Bill was read a second time.

The Finance (New Duties) Bill was considered in Committee on April 12. Little alteration was made in the proposed tax on amusements beyond delaying its application from May 1 to 15, and the exclusion from it of philanthropic and educational entertainments, and entertainments intended only for the amusement of children. The most important modification introduced into the Bill, however, was in Clause 3 which imposed the duties on railway fares. A long list of amendments had been put down with reference to this Clause; and Mr. Montagu stated that if the Government were to meet all the hardships which would arise from the tax on railway tickets, the revenue from it would not be worth collecting, and they had, therefore, decided, with considerable reluctance, to withdraw the Clause. This announcement was received with general satisfaction. The Match Tax was saved by an important concession to manufacturers. Mr. McKenna stated that it had been decided to reduce the proposed tax on boxes of matches which contained more than 80 matches. The customs and excise duties on such boxes would be at the rate of 1s. 9d. and 1s. 8d. respectively per 10,000 instead of 3s. 6d. and 3s. 4d. as originally contemplated. It was announced also that mechanical lighters would be brought within the scope of the tax. Thereafter the greater part of the Bill had an easy passage through the Committee, the Mineral Water Clause, however, being held over to give Mr. McKenna an opportunity of meeting representatives of the Mineral Water Trade. On the following day the Committee stage was concluded and the Bill was read a third time.

Throughout April Mr. Hughes, the Prime Minister of Australia, continued making speeches from time to time. In deference to the strong feeling that he should be one of the British representatives at the forthcoming Paris Conference, Mr. Asquith announced in the House of Commons on April 6 that the Government would be very glad to make use of his services in this way; and on April 10 the Prime Minister further

announced that the Cabinet had actually invited Mr. Hughes to be one of the representatives of the Imperial Government on that occasion. Mr. Asquith explained that the hesitation in coming to a decision on this subject had been due to the uncertainty whether it would be possible for Mr. Hughes to remain in this country till the date of the Conference.

The Conference itself formed a subject of debate in the House of Lords on April 11. The debate was opened by Lord Courtney of Penwith who asked for a return showing the invitations addressed to the Government to join in the Paris Conference, the replies to the invitations, and the instructions given to the representatives of the Government. Lord Courtney expressed the fear that the aim of the Conference was to prolong the war with Germany after the declaration of peace. This aim he strongly deprecated, pointing out the difficulties in the way of differentiating tariffs as between the British Dominions and the Allies of this country, as for example, Russia, who supplied us with commodities which also came from the Dominions. He pressed for an exact definition of the capacity in which Mr. Hughes would attend the Conference. Lord Bryce similarly directed attention to the dangers of founding a commercial policy on motives of resentment and revenge.

Lord Crewe, while admitting many of the points made by the critics of the Conference, insisted that there were matters in relation to commerce with Germany which were fit to be discussed at a Conference between the Allies without committing any of the countries represented to a final policy. Germany had combined commercial expansion with political intrigue with an audacity and success which had no parallel in modern times, and he did not believe that we could separate the military ambitions of Germany which had set the world on fire from the commercial aggressiveness of that country all over the world. Mr. Hughes would attend the Conference as an Imperial representative, and Lord Crewe had no doubt that he would take a distinguished part in its deliberations. The only instructions with which the British representatives would go were that they should keep their eyes and their minds open, and assist in exploring the subjects which would be brought before the Conference. They would go and they would return without committing the Government to any definite course of action. It was impossible to have too many opportunities of exchanging views with our Allies. Lord Crewe having no papers to lay before the House, Lord Courtney withdrew his motion for a return.

From April 18 to the end of the month Mr. Hughes made a number of speeches in favour of a strong policy to be adopted against Germany. On the 18th of the month he was presented with the Freedom of the City of London, and on the following day he was entertained at dinner in the House of Commons by the representatives of organised labour in this country. On that occasion he spoke at length on the strides made by the labour

movement in Australia, the steps taken by the Commonwealth Government to destroy Germany's former hold on Australian industries, the need of a great national policy of reconstruction involving a change in the fiscal policy of Great Britain, and the urgent necessity for the complete reorganisation of the resources of the Allies in order to bring about a speedy and decisive victory.

The Australian Prime Minister made another important speech on April 28 when he addressed a Conference of about 200 representatives of commercial, trade union, and agricultural organisations in Glasgow. He referred to warnings against the policy of revenge in regard to Germany after the war and advocated a new crusade and a "national policy"; the two aims of that policy being, first, to shorten the war, and next to build up a solid foundation for the economic and social welfare of the whole Empire. We must strike a blow, he said, at the economic heart of the enemy and go over Great Britain with the harrows of resolute protest, tearing up every vestige of German influence.

The demand for vigorous economic measures against Germany, both during and after the war, derived great impetus from a report published by the Government Committee upon the treatment by the enemy of the British prisoners of war, dealing with the conditions of the Camp at Wittenberg during and before an epidemic of typhus fever which had devastated that Camp in the first six months of 1915. The information upon which the report was based had been collected from three prisoners of war who had been repatriated from Wittenberg, Major Priestley, Captain Vidal, and Captain Lauder of the R.A.M.C., who were sent to the Camp soon after the outbreak of the epidemic and were only released from Germany towards the end of February, 1916. The report of Mr. Justice Younger's Committee showed that the Germans had herded about 15,000 prisoners or more within wire entanglements. Most of these were Russians who had the seeds of typhus fever among them, and it was ordered that they should be mixed with the other nationalities. Over-crowding, the bitter cold of the winter, want of adequate heating and clothing, and bad and insufficient food, all predisposed the men to infection. It was actually carried by lice, with which the prisoners swarmed, as the only washing material allowed them was an occasional cupful of soft soap between 120 soldiers. When the epidemic broke out the whole German medical staff went off. They did not give the sick the slightest medical aid throughout the visitation. In the middle of February English doctors were marched into the Camp; and Captain Lauder gave an account of the horrors he saw there. In the improvised hospital there were no mattresses, the typhus patients had to be carried there on the tables from which the men ate, and these tables could not be cleaned because there was no soap. For the first month the sick had half

a cup of milk a day, and there was not even warm water to mix with it. Stimulants, bandages, everything was lacking, and men lost their limbs by gangrene for want of socks. There was not even soap for the sick until it came from England.

According to the report, the German authorities knew quite well the horrors of the Camp. There was plenty of food and medical supplies outside, but representations were commonly met by a refusal, and the chief German medical authority spoke of the "English swine," and when the dead were carried out the people of Wittenberg were allowed to jeer at the coffins. It appeared that the man mainly responsible for this neglect was the Oberstabsarzt, Dr. Aschenbach, who had since been awarded the Iron Cross "for his services in combating the epidemic." Immediately on the publication of this report attention was drawn to it in the House of Commons on April 10 by Sir Henry Dalziel. Lord Robert Cecil stated that steps were being taken to bring the report to the notice of neutral countries. He also added that it would be circulated as a Parliamentary paper.

There was no doubt that the story of the Wittenberg affair did much to fortify the determination of the people to prosecute the war with all the energy at their disposal. Throughout the month of April the controversy over compulsory military service continued to rage with increasing vehemence. As before, compulsion found its chief advocacy among the newspapers of the Northcliffe press, opposition coming from the Liberal newspapers such as the *Daily News*, the *Daily Chronicle*, and the *Manchester Guardian*. It was, however, clear almost from the first that the country would be prepared to accept compulsion so soon as it was convinced of the necessity of that measure; and indeed it was interesting to watch the increasing body of sentiment in favour of universal compulsion which grew up between the end of March and the first week of May.

We have already recorded the pronouncement of the Liberal War Committee in the House of Commons in favour of universal compulsion. The Unionist War Committee followed suit on March 28 by publicly announcing their adhesion to the principle of "equal sacrifices from all men of military age." The Unionist Committee which was prompted largely by Sir Edward Carson agreed at the same time to give the Government a week in which to consider the matter.

On the following day a discussion took place in the House of Commons on the arrangements which were to be made for the release of attested married men from certain of their civil obligations. Mr. Long began his statement by justifying the claim that the Government had done their best to get the largest number of available single men for military service before calling upon the married men who had attested under Lord Derby's Group scheme. The House and the country knew already that the Government had gone a considerable way towards meeting the suggestion made by Lord Derby in his last speech in the

House of Lords, but Mr. Long repeated that some trades had been removed from the list of reserved occupations, that the reservations had been cancelled in the case of single men below certain ages, that men who had gone into reserved occupations since August 16, 1915—the date of the Registration Act—would not be regarded as belonging to reserved occupations, and that in agricultural occupations exemption would in future be removed in regard to single men up to the age of 25 in most cases, and up to 30 in some cases. Mr. Long expressed the belief that this measure would release a considerable number of single men for the army, and so postpone the call upon the attested married men. Altogether 275,000 women were doing work which before the war was done by men. 14,000 of these were engaged in agriculture; and in Norfolk alone 4,000 women had announced their willingness to work on the land. Mr. Long then stated that the Government had decided to undertake an immediate revision of the Registration Act, and to issue an order compelling registered persons to produce their certificates of registration when required. An order would also be issued obliging employers to see that their employees were properly registered. Finally it was intended to call up the men under the first Derby Group up to the age of 18½ years for training at home.

With regard to the civil obligations of the attested men Mr. Long's proposals were as follows:—

1. Such sums as were necessary were to be given to the Statutory Pensions Committee to enable them to make grants to men already in the Army, or then being called up, to meet cases of hardships arising out of their liabilities. These grants were to be distributed according to rules drawn up by the Statutory Committee with the approval of the Treasury.

2. The Courts (Emergency Powers) Act was to be amended so as to apply to contracts made since the war in the same way as it applied to contracts made before the war.

3. Authority was to be given to County Court Judges to hear and determine applications by enlisted men in certain cases to have their leases broken.

Sir Edward Carson took the opportunity of declaring that in his opinion the only way of arresting the present agitation and removing the grievance of the married men was to extend compulsion to all men of military age. He criticised the Government for their unsystematic methods of recruiting, and pointed out that although they had promised the married men that the unmarried men would be taken first they were only now beginning to inquire where the unmarried men were, and the married men were being called up before it was known how many unmarried men were available.

Mr. Long's statement showed at all events that the Government were not yet prepared to institute a scheme of universal compulsory service; and forthwith the agitation in favour of that

measure assumed a more vigorous character, both in the Press and in the War Committees of the two parties in the House of Commons. On April 3 a deputation from the National Union of Attested Married Men waited on Lord Derby at the War Office to place their grievances before him, and to demand, among other things, the general adoption of compulsion. On April 12 another deputation of the same body was received by Mr. Asquith who however showed no great sympathy with the views of the deputation. He pointed out that he had never given any undertaking to apply compulsion to married men who had not attested, and he limited himself to a promise to see what could be done for the release from attestation of those married men who had been misled by erroneous statements of recruiting officers and others. Already on April 6 the first eight Groups of attested married men began to report for service.

It is perhaps unnecessary to detail the various propagandist methods employed to induce the Government to come into line with the demands for conscription. It was understood that the Army Council on April 11 had furnished the Cabinet with a statement of their requirements of men, requirements which could scarcely be met unless compulsion were introduced. On the following day the Unionist War Committee passed a resolution requesting Sir Edward Carson to bring forward a motion in the House of Commons embodying the policy to which they had committed themselves. The request was immediately carried out. Meanwhile, a Cabinet Committee had been appointed, consisting of the Prime Minister, Mr. McKenna, Lord Lansdowne, and Mr. Chamberlain for the purpose of examining the figures of recruiting, to enable the Government to decide upon a policy. The Committee circulated its report to the Cabinet on 14 April; they came unanimously to the conclusion that no case had been established for the extension of the Military Service Act to all men of military age. Their main suggestions were as follows: that the present Act should be extended to include those men who had reached the age of 18 since August 15, 1915, or who might reach that age hereafter: a measure should be passed to retain with the Colours all time-expired Regulars and Territorials; the further "combing out" of single men from starred trades and munition factories; and, finally, perseverance with all existing methods of enlistment, including the Derby Scheme and the Military Service Act. This report, however, the Cabinet declined to accept, and the subject was referred back to the Committee of four with instructions to re-examine the case put forward by the Military Authorities. Hereupon it became evident that there were great difficulties in the way of reaching agreement. The soldiers held that their requirements in men could not be met without the introduction of universal service, whereas the Committee of four believed that their proposed recommendations would suffice. There was great tension among Members in the House of Com-

mons when they met on April 18 to hear the statement which was to be made by Mr. Asquith as to the policy of recruiting; but when the time came for making this statement the difficulties were still existent and the Prime Minister was compelled to ask the House to adjourn the matter for another day. This unexpected development, however, did not prevent Lord Milner from bringing forward a motion in the House of Lords in favour of compulsory military service. He implored the Government to place recruiting for the Army on the only satisfactory basis, that of equality of obligations. He said that he and many others had hoped, when the Coalition Government was formed, that the country was at last prepared to fight with all its might, but they had been disappointed. All that had happened was that the voluntary system had degenerated until it had become a system of cajolery and threats. The Derby Scheme merely meant a postponing of military compulsion from November to January. When it came then, it was only for single men. He referred to the ease with which the National Service Act had been passed through Parliament as conclusive proof that the country would accept anything which the Government declared to be essential to the prosecution of the war. At the conclusion of Lord Milner's speech, Lord Crewe stated that the Government were "still thinking," and they proposed, therefore, not to continue the debate until they were in a position to make a statement. Lord Salisbury, however, asserted that the Government were losing the confidence of the country and begged those Ministers who were unable to make up their minds rapidly in time of war to stand aside.

Yet the Government were still unable to reach a decision; and when the House of Commons met on the following day the Prime Minister was compelled once again to ask permission for the postponement of his statement. He said that there were still points of disagreement in the Cabinet, and if these points were not settled, the result must be the break-up of the Government. The Cabinet, Mr. Asquith protested, was united in the belief that such an event would be a national disaster of the most formidable kind. It was in the hope that this might be averted by a few more days' deliberation that he moved an adjournment of the House over the week-end. Sir Edward Carson thereupon rose to express regret at the delay which had arisen from day to day in the expected statement of the Prime Minister on recruiting; he did not make, however, any criticism on the course which had been taken, and he would be satisfied if it was understood that the relative position to his motion was maintained.

Although the motion for adjournment met with no opposition in the House of Commons, it was opposed by Lord Milner in the House of Lords on the grounds that the best way to induce doubtful Ministers to come to a decision was to go on with the debate. Lord Lansdowne admitted that he could scarcely con-

ceive a more mortifying position ; the Government was threatened with a loss of authority which was likely to result from their apparent inability to deal at once with a matter of such national importance, but the reasons for delay now were imperative. Serious differences of opinion had arisen within the Cabinet with regard to recruiting. Those differences were so grave as to threaten the break-up of the Government, and in the view of Ministers the collapse of the Government at this moment would be the greatest national disaster ; it would have deplorable effects, both in this country and among our Allies, and it would afford the utmost encouragement to our enemies.

The general fears which had been expressed of a Cabinet disruption were, however, speedily dissipated, for on the following day, April 20, an official statement was issued announcing that the Cabinet had reached an agreement upon the proposals which they would make to Parliament on the subject of recruiting, and that these proposals would be submitted to a Secret Session in each House of Parliament, arranged for the following Tuesday. A second official communication stated that a settlement had been reached, satisfactory to all sections of opinion represented in the Government, while yet meeting the demands of the military situation. The purpose of the Secret Session was merely to inform Parliament confidentially of the main facts and figures on which the decision of the Cabinet was based, the publication of which must obviously be undesirable.

The reader may perhaps have noticed with surprise that we have been able to give an account of the negotiations which took place within the Cabinet on the subject of compulsory military service. We might indeed have gone further, and indicated what Members of the Cabinet were opposed to compulsory service and what Members advocated it ; for this was pretty well known at the time. In fact, the proceedings of each Cabinet Meeting were known almost immediately afterwards, and were often published in the newspapers on the following morning. This leakage of secrets became so serious that it was found necessary to stop it by adding a new amendment to the Defence of the Realm Regulations. This amendment which was passed at a meeting of the Privy Council at Windsor on April 22, declared that it was illegal to publish any report of what might occur, either in the Secret Session in the House of Commons or at any meetings of the Cabinet, unless the report was officially communicated through the directors of the Press Bureau. Following upon this amendment, Cabinet secrets were tolerably well preserved, although there was much criticism in the newspapers that a measure of this character should be necessary to prevent Ministers from giving away their own secrets. The final adoption of compulsory service did not take place until after Easter ; and we postpone, therefore, to the following chapter the conclusion of the history of this important campaign.

Returning now to the question of Air Defence, important changes took place in the second week of April on the Joint Air Committee, when both Lord Derby and Lord Montagu of Beaulieu resigned their seats.

Speaking at Birmingham on April 12 Lord Montagu described the causes which had led to his resignation. He said that he and Lord Derby had found that the Committee had no real power, and that it was perhaps lulling the public into a sense of false security. The power of defence in this war had largely stopped the offence, and would drive warfare beneath the sea and into the air. He questioned whether it was possible to go on running the air defence of the country by two and sometimes three Departments without any link and with the traditional jealousies existing between them. The country would never have secured its present supremacy in the matter of munitions unless it had had a separate department to concentrate on the subject, and he wished to see something of the same kind established in regard to aviation. Lord Montagu called for a properly constituted party to deal with all questions which affected the output of men and machines for the use of the fighting forces; and he insisted upon a strong air policy if the country were not to suffer in the coming months of the war. This appeal he repeated on April 28 at a demonstration arranged by the Navy League at the Queen's Hall to urge on the Government the pressing necessity for more vigorous and comprehensive measures in relation to air-craft as an arm of national defence. At this meeting a resolution was unanimously passed approving as the best means to that end the creation of a Board of Aviation under the control of an Air Minister with a seat in the Cabinet.

On April 9 a number of French Senators and Deputies arrived in London as the guests of the Franco-British Inter-Parliamentary Committee, and on the 10th they were addressed by the Prime Minister, who made an important speech in reply to that of the German Imperial Chancellor in the Reichstag the previous week (see chapter on Germany). Mr. Asquith drew attention to the suggestion of the German Chancellor that if there were to be peace discussions, England must assume the attitude of a defeated nation to a victorious enemy; but he said that we were not defeated and we were not going to be defeated. Our peace terms were nothing less than the accomplishment of the purpose for which we took up arms. England and France were both driven to that course, in order to prevent Germany from establishing a position of military menace and domination over her neighbours. The purpose of the Allies was to defeat Germany's attempt to secure ascendancy by tearing up the Treaty basis of European policy, and so to pave the way for an international system which would secure the principle of equal rights for all civilised states. We intended to establish the principle that International problems must be handled by free negotiation on equal terms between free peoples unhampered by overmastering

Prussian military dictation. We were champions, he said, not only of Treaty rights but of the independent status and free development of the weaker countries. Finally, in reply to the Chancellor's statement that there was to be a new Belgium, he affirmed that the purpose of the Allies was to restore the old Belgium.

The last event to be recorded before Easter is the issue of a bye-election at Wimbledon in which the Coalition candidate was Sir Stuart Coats, who was supported by both the great Party organisations. He was opposed by Mr. Kennedy Jones, who stood as an Independent candidate in general opposition to the Government and taking for his chief cry "Do it now" as against "Wait and see." This constituency which had hitherto been represented by Mr. Chaplin with immense majorities, now elected Sir Stuart Coats on April 20 by a majority of only 1,811. The result was taken to imply a weakening of the position of the Government in the country, and there can be little doubt that their hesitation on the subject of compulsory military service was responsible for a considerably diminished support in this traditionally Conservative constituency. At all events the Government soon found themselves unable any longer to resist the obvious feeling of the country, and the most important business of Parliament after Easter was that of placing the whole subject of recruiting upon a new basis.

CHAPTER III.

THE SUMMER MONTHS.

THE Easter holidays were no sooner over than matters of the utmost importance came before the attention of the public. On April 25 the first announcement was made of the outbreak in Dublin, and on the same day the Secret Sessions were held in both Houses of Parliament for the purpose of informing members of the facts and figures which underlay the problem of recruiting. Before proceeding to a relation of the circumstances connected with the Irish Rebellion, we shall conclude the account of the final adoption of conscription, the discussion of which was carried on in Parliament almost to the end of the month of May.

When the House of Commons met on April 25, Mr. Asquith arose and called the Speaker's attention to the presence of strangers in the House, whereupon they were ordered by the Speaker to withdraw. In the House of Lords a Secret Session had already been provided for by an order of the Lord Great Chamberlain excluding all strangers from the House. We are of course unable to give any report of the proceedings in either House, but an official account was afterwards communicated to the Press in which the proposals of the Government were embodied. These were limited to three headings :—

(a) The prolongation until the end of the war of the service of time-expired men whose period of service under the existing law would be extended for one year only.

(b) To empower the Military Authorities to transfer men enlisted for Territorial battalions to any unit where they were needed.

(c) To render an exempted man liable to military service immediately on the expiry of his certificate of exemption.

The Government proposed further to bring under the terms of the Military Service Act all youths as they reached the age of 18.

Recognising, however, that these measures would be inadequate to supply the Army with the men it required, the Government intended to make a fresh effort to obtain by voluntary enlistment a further proportion of the unattested married men. If at the end of the four weeks ending May 27, 50,000 of these men had not been secured by direct enlistment, the Government would forthwith ask Parliament for compulsory powers. If in any week after May 27, 15,000 had not been secured by direct enlistment, the same course would be taken, any surplus over 15,000 in one week being carried over to the next. Finally, these arrangements were to hold good until 200,000 unattested men had been obtained. The communication made to the Press stated also that a special Committee had been set up for the purpose of considering the question of grants to be made to single as well as married men who had joined the forces and suffered financial hardship thereby.

These proposals were dead in two days. The Secret Session of April 25 was followed by an Ordinary Session of the House of Commons on April 27, when Mr. Long asked leave to introduce a Bill founded upon the new proposals. The first attack came from Sir Edward Carson, who declared that although he was in favour of compulsion it ought to be fair; nothing could be meaner, he said, than to coerce time-expired soldiers to begin service again before the Government had compelled the shirker to give any service in the Army at all. He did not believe that the House of Commons would tolerate such an injustice. Unless the Bill were turned into a general compulsion Bill it would receive very little support.

The new Bill was equally opposed by the Anti-Compulsionists on the ground that it was a step towards a complete scheme of compulsion within the next few weeks. Mr. Stephen Walsh, one of the Labour Party, spoke strongly in favour of Universal Compulsion; while Mr. Duke described the Bill as a "monument of political ineptitude." It was attacked by numerous other members, and not a word was said by any one in its favour. So plain was the feeling in all quarters of the House that Mr. Asquith at last arose and said that in view of so much hostile sentiment the Government would not feel justified in proceeding

any further with these particular proposals. Mr. Long accordingly asked leave to withdraw his request for permission to introduce the Bill, and the House agreed to its withdrawal without a single dissentient voice.

Five days later Mr. Asquith described to the House of Commons a new Bill for the establishment of Universal Compulsory Service. He stated that the Secret Session, and the instalment system of compulsion attempted the previous week, had been adopted to meet the views of the Labour representatives. He explained that during the war our Army had increased from six Regular and fourteen Territorial divisions with the addition of six Over-seas divisions, twenty-six divisions in all, to forty-two Regular and twenty-eight Territorial divisions, making seventy in all. The Naval division made the total seventy-one, and twelve divisions from the Dominions made it eighty-three. The total Military and Naval effort of the Empire was therefore represented by a number which exceeded five million men. The Government, he continued, had reached the conclusion in the course of April that the provision of the men asked for by the War Office, including the 200,000 who were still unattested, was vital to the maintenance of our strength in the field, and that it was the duty of the country to provide the men. The measure thus promised by the Government was warmly welcomed by Sir Edward Carson, who regretted only that it had not been proposed at an earlier stage of the war. It was opposed on the other hand by Sir John Simon, who held that no case had been made out for general compulsion. The Bill was introduced on May 3, its main provisions being as follows:—

All males between the ages of 18 and 41, married or single, were subjected to compulsory enlistment in the Army. Every male person was to come within the operation of the Bill as he reached the age of 18. The Bill was to come into force thirty days after it had been passed. The service of men already in the Army, whose time was about to expire, would be continued for the period of the war; and men whose time had already expired, and who had left the Army, would be recalled if they were under the age of 41. Power was given to the Army Council to review the medical certificates of men medically rejected since August 14, 1915. The exceptions were the same as those already arranged under the earlier Military Service Act.

This new Bill was received by the House of Commons in a very different manner from its unfortunate predecessor of the week before, although Sir John Simon again intimated that he and his friends would vote against the second reading. An appeal was made by Colonel Craig to include Ireland in the Bill; but it was pointed out by Mr. Long that this could be done later, if thought advisable, by an amending Bill.

The second reading was taken on May 4, when Mr. R. D. Holt, the Liberal shipowner, moved its rejection on the ground

that no more men could be spared from industry ; the motion being seconded by Mr. H. B. Lees Smith. The defence of the Bill was then taken up by Mr. Lloyd George. He pointed out that it was a very serious thing for members to oppose the advice of the Military Authorities, who believed that the men who could be supplied by this Bill alone would make the difference between defeat and victory. He would, he said, rather be driven out of the Liberal Party and indeed out of public life than have on his conscience such opposition as that. It was of the essence of a system of compulsion that men should not be taken for the Army who could be better employed in shipbuilding or any other industry ; and compulsion was the best guarantee against such instances of bad organisation. He affirmed that there was a vast majority both in the House and in the country in favour of the Bill, for no country had saved itself from great military peril without resort to compulsory service. The majority of the speeches, which followed, accepted and supported the Bill, but Sir John Simon repeated his former objections to compulsion, although agreeing that there was no limit to the sacrifices which we ought to make to win the war. The Bill was defended in particular by Mr. Henderson who in the course of his speech gave figures with regard to the men obtained under the previous Military Service Act. The critics of that Act had represented that it could not possibly bring in the 650,000 men which the Government anticipated. As a matter of fact, Mr. Henderson stated, it had brought in 750,000, of whom the Army would receive 300,000 and had already received 187,000. Throughout the debate it was noticeable that far less excitement prevailed among members than had been the case during the passage of the previous Act earlier in the year. After a comparatively short debate the second reading was carried by 328 votes against 36, giving a majority of 292. The minority was composed of 26 Liberals, 9 Labour Members, and one Independent Nationalist (Mr. Ginnell).

The Committee stage of the Military Service Bill was taken on May 9. Sir John Lonsdale moved an amendment, the effect of which would have been to bring Ireland within the scope of the measure. This suggestion, however, was opposed by Mr. Asquith, who said that compulsion in regard to Ireland was not a matter of agreement, and its introduction at present would involve delay in the passage of a measure which was urgently demanded by the Army. Sir Edward Carson affirmed that the real reason for the exclusion of Ireland was the advice of Mr. Redmond. If Mr. Redmond, knowing his countrymen as he did, declared that it would be impossible to carry out compulsion in Ireland the matter must remain there. He thought that Irishmen must feel it as something of a disgrace to Ireland, and he blamed the Government for failing to suppress the anti-recruiting campaign in that country.

Sir Edward Carson was followed by Mr. Redmond himself,

who declared that it would not only be wrong and unwise, but even insane to attempt to enforce compulsion in Ireland in existing circumstances. He expressed his conviction that if Irishmen had had both power and responsibility in the government of Ireland during the last two years, the recent occurrences in that country would not have happened. He had done his best for recruiting and he claimed that Ireland had done well in the war. Ultimately, the amendment was withdrawn without a division.

But the part of the Military Service Bill which gave greater difficulty than any other was that which concerned Conscientious Objectors. On May 11 a prolonged discussion took place on this subject, and Mr. Harvey moved a new clause to secure that the condition attaching to the exemption of Conscientious Objectors should be the performance of some work of national importance that did not involve service under any Military Authority. Lord Hugh Cecil and a number of other members urged that no penalty should attach to Conscientious Objection. Mr. Long, who confessed that he almost despaired of finding a solution of the difficulty, invited practical suggestions as to how Conscientious Objectors should be dealt with. The proposed new clause, however, was withdrawn.

In the course of its passage through Committee few alterations of any importance were made. Amendments were introduced for limiting the prolongation of the service of Territorials, whose time for discharge occurred before the end of the war, to men under 41; for the restoration of men already discharged to their former rank on re-enlistment; for the re-examination under certain conditions of men medically rejected since August 14, 1915; for the exemption from military service of any person who had been a prisoner of war, and a few other minor points.

On the report stage on May 15, the question of Conscientious Objection was again prominent. Sir Frederick Banbury urged that no one should be considered as a Conscientious Objector who had not on June 1, 1914, belonged to a religious body one of whose tenets was hostility to combatant military service, but this suggestion was subsequently withdrawn. Mr. Edmund Harvey moved a new clause with the general object of saving the Conscientious Objector from penalties; and Mr. Long undertook to introduce into the Bill words pointing out that Tribunals might give certificates of exemption from all forms of military service. On one of Mr. Harvey's amendments a division took place, and it was found that the champions of the Conscientious Objector numbered fifty-two in the Lobby.

The question of the exemption of the sole head of a business was discussed on the same day. It appeared to be felt that special favour should be shown to persons who came under this category; but Mr. Long took the line that there were legal dangers in statutory definition, and he thought that the sole heads of businesses would be much better off if they relied upon the

general terms of the Bill. He undertook to issue a circular to the Tribunals calling attention to the special claims of such men, and suggesting to them that these cases required serious consideration. After some further discussion the amendment moved by Mr. King on this subject was defeated by a majority of 123.

A long debate took place on May 16 on the proposal to review medical certificates of exemption already granted; and as a result of this debate the Government promised:—

1. That men would not be recalled for re-examination who had already been so thoroughly examined that their exemptions were recorded in the official documents retained by the Military Authorities, and

2. That the Adjutant-General would be urged to fix a date by which the Army Council must give notice to the medically rejected that they had to present themselves for medical examination afresh.

An amendment for the purpose of raising the minimum age of conscripts from 18 to 19 was rejected by a large majority, but words were incorporated in the Bill to insure that no soldier under 19 should be sent out of the country except in case of military necessity.

The Labour Party showed considerable opposition to the clause which reduced to two weeks the two months' grace from military compulsion allowed by the original Act to munition workers out of employment. An amendment was proposed that the earlier period should be restored in the present Bill with safeguards to insure that the privilege should be limited to men engaged in work of national importance. Mr. Long agreed to accept this amendment and was in consequence somewhat warmly attacked by Sir Frederick Baubury who charged him and the Government with having, at the dictation of the Labour Party, gone back upon their undertaking to the House of Commons. Nevertheless, the amendment was carried without a division, and the report stage being then concluded the House divided on the motion for the third reading, which was carried by 250 votes against 35, the minority consisting of 26 Liberals and 9 Labour Members.

The Military Service Bill having thus passed safely through the House of Commons found an easy passage through the House of Lords. In the course of the second reading debate on May 18, Lord Lansdowne announced that a scheme was under consideration for dealing with Conscientious Objectors. He referred to the difficulties of the Tribunals, which he said were doing their work increasingly well. He thought that it would be a mistake in the effort to avoid injustice to open the door too wide to possible exemptions. During the Committee stage on May 22, Lord Reay moved an amendment with the object of reducing the period of grace to be allowed to men in certified occupations or in munition works from two months to two

weeks. The amendment reserved the full period of two months for those who could prove the bona-fide nature of their occupations, by showing that they were similarly engaged before August, 1915; and was aimed only at the men who had gone into such occupations in order to avoid military service. This amendment was agreed to, and on May 23 the third reading was carried. When the Lords' amendments were considered in the House of Commons on May 24 no change of any importance was made. There was considerable discussion about industrial compulsion; and the Labour Party forced a division on the Lords' amendments limiting the period of grace for men who had lost their certificates of exemption; but the Government, and eventually the House, accepted the amendment, and Mr. Long disarmed much of the opposition by announcing that in order to prevent industrial compulsion the Labour Party had been asked to join a small Committee to advise the Army Council on these problems. The Bill received the Royal assent on May 25. During its passage through Parliament there had been singularly little opposition shown in the country. On April 29 the Scottish Trade Union Congress at Glasgow had declared by 66 votes to 46 its strong opposition to Compulsory Military Service, and had called on the Labour Party to press the Government to repeal the Military Service Act. Once again, in the middle of May, a body called the Anti-Conscription Council held a meeting to protest against the administration of the Military Service Act, and a strong body of police was required to prevent the meeting from being broken up. But these signs of opposition were noticeable chiefly on account of their weakness and the extraordinary lack of public support which they obtained. In the whole history of the country few Bills of such vital importance had ever passed through Parliament with less opposition, or with more universal assent.

The Order in Council prohibiting the publication of Cabinet secrets was discussed early in May by both Houses of Parliament. In the House of Lords Lord Parmoor asserted that when Cabinet secrets were disclosed the Minister was no less responsible than the journalist. Lord Burnham likewise defended the Press, stating that the first thing the Government ought to do was to impose a more rigorous rule of silence on themselves. Lord Buckmaster, defending the Order, said that it did not follow when a Cabinet secret was disclosed that it was necessarily due to the indiscretion of a Cabinet Minister. The Minister might not have the faintest idea that he was giving away matters which he ought to conceal.

In the House of Commons the debate was raised on a resolution moved by Sir Henry Dalziel calling for an immediate and material modification in the Order. He asked whether the regulations imposing penalties applied to members of the Cabinet as well as to the newspapers which published Cabinet secrets. If Cabinet secrecy was betrayed it could only be by

members of the Cabinet. He asked whether it was intended to prosecute Lord Curzon and Mr. Lloyd George who had lately disclosed Cabinet proceedings. The regulation, however, was defended by Mr. Salter and Mr. Gordon Hewart on the ground that it was designed to deal with a national scandal and danger. They both contended that the regulation restrained Cabinet ministers as well as journalists, and they agreed that it was a misapprehension to represent it as an attack on the liberty of the Press. The Government reply was made by Mr. Herbert Samuel. He said that the inviolate secrecy of Cabinet meetings was as essential to the Government as the publicity of Parliament; and the time was overdue when the reporting of Cabinet meetings must be stopped. The newspapers would not be prevented from publishing decisions of the Government, and no action would be taken against newspapers for mere criticism. Newspapers had honourably observed the confidence which had been reposed in them, but it was not for the honourable but the unscrupulous newspapers that this regulation had been made. Finally, the resolution of Sir Henry Dalziel was negatived without a division.

We have now to deal with by far the most important and most disagreeable incident which occurred in English history in the course of the year. As early as March 4 *The Times* had published an article drawing attention to the growth of the Sinn-Fein movement in Ireland and commenting on the neglect of the Government to take strong measures for suppressing the disaffection which appeared to be brewing in that country. At length on the Tuesday after Easter the Secretary of the Admiralty announced that during the night of April 20 an attempt had been made to land arms and ammunition in Ireland by a vessel disguised as a neutral merchant ship, but in reality a German auxiliary, in conjunction with a German submarine. The auxiliary was sunk and a number of prisoners were made, among whom was Sir Roger Casement, who had already acquired an unenviable notoriety since the outbreak of the war owing to his endeavour to seduce Irish prisoners in Germany from their loyalty to the British Crown. The attempt to land arms in Ireland was evidently a preconcerted signal for a general rising, and on April 24 serious disturbances broke out in Dublin. A large body of men identified with the Sinn-Feiners, mostly armed, occupied Stephen's Green, and took forcible possession of the Post Office, where they cut the telegraphic and telephonic wires. Houses were also occupied in Stephen's Green, Sackville Street, Abbey Street, and along the quays. In the course of the day soldiers arrived from the Curragh, and fighting immediately began. The rebels made a half-hearted attack on Dublin Castle which, however, was not pressed through. They held up troops on their way from barracks, and fired on them from the windows of houses; but by the following day they had been driven out of Stephen's Green with a number of casualties, although they were

still in occupation of various important buildings, including the Post Office, the City Hall, and the Law Courts. Reinforcements speedily arrived from Belfast and from England, and established a cordon round the centre of the town on the north bank of the river, entirely enclosing the area of the rebellion. By April 26 Liberty Hall, the head-quarters of the citizen army and formerly of Mr. Larkin, had been wholly or partially destroyed and occupied by the military. By this time the troops had suffered casualties to the extent of about 19 killed and 27 wounded.

Meanwhile, risings, although of a far less serious character, had taken place in other parts of Ireland, notably at Ardee in County Louth, and at Swords and Lusk, near Dublin. Moreover, on April 25 German warships once again succeeded in getting across the North Sea and bombarding Lowestoft and Yarmouth for about half an hour, doing, however, very little damage. The purpose of this useless raid was, no doubt, to cause the British Government to hesitate before sending large numbers of troops over to Ireland. On April 27 the situation seemed sufficiently serious to justify the Irish Executive in proclaiming martial law over the whole of Ireland, and Sir John Maxwell left London on that date with plenary powers over the whole country, the Irish Executive having placed themselves at his disposal to carry out his instructions.

On the same day a discussion on the subject took place in the House of Commons, when Mr. Butcher expressed his view that the Government were stamping out the rebellion with all possible vigour and promptitude. Sir Edward Carson likewise affirmed his satisfaction with the measures taken by the Government, and said that he would gladly join with Mr. Redmond in everything that could be done to put down the rebels. Mr. Redmond himself also spoke and asked leave to express on behalf of the Nationalist party and, he believed, of the overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland the feeling of detestation and horror with which they regarded the recent proceedings; he joined with Sir Edward Carson in the hope that no attempt would be made to use the rising as a political weapon against any party. It was, however, considered inexpedient at this time to give the House much information about the actual state of the movement, which seemed to be developing in various other places, especially in the south and west.

At midnight on April 28-29 an official communiqué was issued describing the progress of the operations for the suppression of the rebellion. By that time the organised forces of the rebels in Dublin were confined to a few localities, the principal one being the Sackville Street district where they had established their head-quarters in the General Post Office. The cordon of troops surrounding this district was gradually drawn closer, although outside the cordon there was not infrequent sniping from houses in which small parties of the rebels had established themselves in various parts of the city. During the last two

days of April the back of the revolt was gradually broken. Large numbers of rebels surrendered in Dublin and more than 700 prisoners, including the Countess Markievicz, were captured. The Post Office was destroyed by the fire of the British guns and the leaders of the revolt sent orders to their adherents in Galway and other parts of the country to abandon their attempt and give themselves up to the military. On the evening of May 1 the Commander-in-Chief of the Home Forces was able to announce that all the rebels in Dublin had surrendered, and that the city was now quite safe. The rebels in the country districts were following suit, and gradually surrendering to the mobile columns which were sent in pursuit of them. At Ennis-corthy the rebels during the night of April 30 offered to surrender their leaders and arms, on condition that the rank and file were allowed to return to their homes. This condition, of course, was not accepted, and on being informed that the only terms which could be entertained were unconditional, the rebels surrendered at 6 o'clock in the morning of May 1. The suppression in Dublin was not achieved without an immense destruction of property. It was believed that the number of rebels in action from start to finish was about 5,000, and the fighting resulted in the outbreak of fires in many parts of the city. At least twenty great business establishments, three branch banks, and dozens of smaller offices and shops were burnt to the ground, as well as the General Post Office already mentioned. The total number of buildings involved in the fires was stated to be 179 and the value of the buildings and their contents was estimated, roughly, at nearly 2,000,000*l*. The area affected on the east side of Sackville Street comprised 27,000 square yards, and that on the west side 34,000 square yards. Outside this district the only important building lost was the Old Linenhall barracks which was fired by bombs thrown by the rebels.

If the measures taken by the Government for preventing the outbreak of this rebellion had been altogether inadequate and shown no recognition of the true significance of the movement, no such charge, at any rate, can be brought against them in respect of the measures which they took for the punishment of the ringleaders and for ensuring the complete restoration of order. The proclamation which was issued by the Sinn-Feiners at the outset of the revolt called upon the people of Ireland to rally to the support of "the Provisional Government of the Irish Republic." This proclamation stated that the Irish Republican Brotherhood having now organised and trained her manhood through her secret revolutionary organisations and having patiently perfected the discipline of the Irish Citizen Army had now seized the right moment for reviving the old traditions of Irish nationhood. The proclamation went on to declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and referred to the long usurpation of that right by a foreign people

and Government who, however, could not extinguish the right except by the destruction of the Irish people. The proclamation then announced that the new Irish Republic was a sovereign independent State; and the signatories pledged their lives and the lives of their comrades in arms to the cause of its army, of its welfare, and of its exaltation among the nations. The Irish Republic, it continued, was entitled to and claimed the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman. It guaranteed religious and civil property, equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens, and expressed the intention of setting up a permanent national Government representative of the whole people of Ireland and elected by the suffrages of all her men and women. But until the success of their arms could render possible the establishment of such a Government, the civil and military affairs of the Republic were to be administered by the so-called Provisional Government on behalf of which the proclamation was issued, signed by seven of its members. By May 3 three of these signatories, namely, P. H. Pearse, T. J. Clarke, and Thomas MacDonagh, had already been sentenced to death by court-martial, and shot, and from day to day for some time afterwards further executions were announced.

It was not until May 3 that the House of Commons was able to discuss the question at length, and the sitting on that day was chiefly devoted to Mr. Birrell's apology for his share of responsibility in the unhappy state of affairs which had arisen. He confessed frankly that he had made an untrue estimate of the Sinn-Fein movement, not of its character or the numbers of persons engaged in it, nor of the localities where it was most to be found, nor of its frequent disloyalties, but of the possibility of disturbances of the kind which had broken out, of the mode of fighting which had been pursued, and of the desperate folly displayed by the leaders and their dupes. As soon as the insurrection was over (on May 1), he had placed his resignation in the hands of the Prime Minister who had accepted it, "no other course being open to me or to him." Mr. Birrell then made some reference to the innumerable criticisms of which he had been the subject. "The error which I have admitted," he said, "which has had great and terrible consequences has not proceeded from any lack of thought or of anxiety. If my critics want to make me wince, and I can do that much better for myself than they can do it for me, they must change their tack." He had subordinated everything in order to maintain unbroken the front of Ireland towards the enemies of the Empire, and in that work he had been gallantly assisted by Mr. Redmond. He had run grave and considerable risks, but what would have been the consequence if he had tackled the Sinn-Fein movement earlier? The insurrection had been no Irish rebellion, and he hoped it would not be associated with past rebellions in the minds of the Irish people.

Throughout this speech the House listened with emotion

and respect. Mr. Asquith expressed the regard of his fellow-members for Mr. Birrell, and said that in the whole of his public life he had not suffered a personal loss which he had felt more acutely. Mr. Redmond also paid a warm tribute to the late Chief Secretary who, he said, had conferred great and imperishable benefits upon Ireland; and he took to himself some share of the blame which Mr. Birrell had taken upon his own shoulders for not having appreciated the dangers of the Sinn-Fein movement. Even Sir Edward Carson said that he recognised that this tragedy had come upon Ireland rather from Mr. Birrell's desire to preserve national unity than from any dereliction of duty on his part. While he affirmed that the conspiracy, which had nothing to do with either of the political parties in Ireland, ought to be punished with courage, he said that no true Irishman called for vengeance.

On May 4 more rebel leaders were shot after trial by court-martial, and the death sentence on a large number of others was commuted to ten years' penal servitude, by the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief. On the 6th the Countess Markievicz was also sentenced to death, but the sentence likewise was commuted to penal servitude for life. By the end of the first week of May the total number of executions was eight; forty-five rebels had been sent to penal servitude for various periods, and two had been sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour.

On May 9 Mr. Asquith announced in the House of Commons that in the course of the Irish rising there had been 521 Government casualties, including 124 killed; 17 Army Officers were killed and 46 wounded; 86 other ranks killed, 311 wounded and 9 missing; while the other casualties were among the Royal Irish Constabulary, the Dublin Metropolitan Police, the Royal Navy and the Loyal Volunteers. Before dealing with the political events which grew out of the Irish rising, we must first turn to the other business of Parliament during the month of May.

The first to be mentioned is the sudden adoption of the principle of Daylight Saving and its rapid passage into law. This measure was advocated for quite different reasons from those which were put forward in its support in the years preceding the war; it was urged in fact purely on grounds of economy. The belief was held that by arranging for an increased hour of daylight during the summer months, a great saving of artificial light would be secured. The subject was raised in the House of Commons on May 8 by Sir Henry Norman, who estimated that altogether 2,500,000*l.* sterling would be saved in lighting. Mr. Herbert Samuel supported the resolution on behalf of the Government, and undertook to introduce a Bill to that effect on the following day if the present resolution were carried, so that the measure might come into operation with as little delay as possible. A division was challenged, but only two members voted against the resolution which was carried by a

majority of 168. The Bill accordingly was introduced on May 10, and provided that in each year during which it remained in force the local time in Great Britain during the summer months should be one hour in advance of Greenwich mean time. The summer months for the year 1916 were defined as beginning on May 21 and ending on October 1. Although the Bill referred explicitly only to the year 1916, it gave power to extend the operation of the Act in any year, so long as the war continued, by Order in Council; and the prescribed period for each year was also to be fixed by Order in Council. The Act had a rapid and uneventful passage through both Houses of Parliament. It received the Royal assent on May 17 and came into operation three days later. The change of time was introduced with singularly little friction and far less trouble than had been anticipated. The only expressions of disapproval came from farmers and from munition workers in cities such as Sheffield. At Northampton a large meeting of farmers was held and a resolution unanimously adopted to adhere as far as possible to real time, as shown by the sun, in the arrangement of work on the farms, and to take as little notice as possible of the "sham time" shown by public clocks. But fortunately perhaps for the Act, the first week of its operation happened to be a week of very fine evenings; and even the farmers, who had put up the only organised opposition, soon became reconciled outwardly at least to the new Act.

Another topic which came several times before Parliament during the latter half of May was that of air defence. During a debate on this subject on the 17th of the month, Mr. Tennant announced that the Government proposed to constitute a Joint Air Board representing both the Army and the Navy, with Lord Curzon as President and Major Baird, the member for Rugby, as its representative in the House of Commons. Lord Sydenham was also to be a member of the Board. The business of this Board was to discuss questions of general policy in relation to aerial warfare, to make representations to the Admiralty and War Office thereon, to discuss and make representations on the types of the machines required, to organise and co-ordinate the supply of material to the two services, and to organise a system of interchange of ideas between the War Office and the Admiralty. If the War Office or the Admiralty declined to act on the recommendations made to them by the President of the Board, he was to refer the question to the War Committee whose decision was to be final.

The debate was opened by Mr. Joynson-Hicks with a motion urging the Government to make adequate provision for a powerful Air Service. He recognised that great improvements had been made in our defences against air raids, although he affirmed that there had been delays throughout in the provision of guns and searchlights. Guns had been sent to the Eastern counties two months previously, fitted to fire only

a certain kind of ammunition, and the appropriate ammunition had not yet been furnished. He said that we were still using the same type of air machines with which we had begun the war, and although we had the men we had not the material to enable us to regain command of the air.

To this speech Mr. Tennant immediately retaliated that it was not accurate to say that the Germans had command of the air, for in the majority of aerial combats we were the winners. We had two types of aeroplanes faster than any German type and two types also as fast as the enemy's fastest. Although it would be indiscreet to reply in public to the numerous allegations which had been made, he affirmed that there had been great improvements in air machines and in our anti-aircraft guns.

The critics of the Air Service found an important ally in Mr. Winston Churchill who at once condemned the establishment of the new Board announced by Mr. Tennant, advocating a Ministry to deal with the matter. He declared that the Government had followed no principle but the familiar one of postponement till the last possible moment, and then of following the line of least resistance. Mr. Churchill defended the Admiralty and Government at length in their policy of not building Zeppelins before the war, and expressed the view that the Germans might probably have invested their money in more profitable ways than in these "frail and feeble monsters." The remedy which he advocated for Zeppelin raids was either to attack the Zeppelins in their sheds or to waylay them at some point over-seas, coming or going. He asked what was the reason for discontinuing the attacks on the air bases of the enemy. The Air Service, he said, had suffered from duality, and the evils of duality would not be remedied by the Government's proposals which seemed to him likely to lead only to first-class disputes between the departments. The Air Service should, in his opinion, be one unified permanent branch of imperial defence under a separate Minister.

Lord Hugh Cecil, who for some time past had himself been a member of the Air Service, claimed that this country was superior to the Germans both in flying material and flying men. He said that we did more flying over the German lines than they did over ours, and there was nothing that the Germans were doing that we could not do. In short, he expressed the view that no Flying Corps in the world was doing more than ours. This claim was later on endorsed by Mr. Bonar Law who mentioned that of 478 aerial combats at the front between British and Germans only 63 had taken place within the British lines, and in these 13 German machines had been brought down and not a single British machine. The reason why the Government had not set up an Air Ministry was because they thought that the arrangement which they now proposed was better, for, after all, the mass of air work would always be in

connexion with the Army or the Navy. But in any case he thought that if an Air Ministry was required the present step was the right way to get it. Mr. Pemberton Billing then continued the debate, but so little interest was taken in his observations that the House was found to be nearly empty and members were counted out, the debate thus ending abruptly. On the following day the first meeting was held of the Committee which had been appointed by the Government "to inquire into and report upon the administration and command of the Royal Flying Corps with particular reference to the charges made both in Parliament and elsewhere against the officials and officers responsible for that administration and command, and to make any recommendations in relation thereto."

The corresponding debate on the Air Service in the House of Lords occupied two days. It was introduced by Lord Montagu on May 23 with a resolution in favour of concentrating under a single control the supply of men and materials for the Air Service, while leaving the Executive power over naval and military air-craft with the Navy and the Army. Lord Montagu repeated the account, previously referred to, of the circumstances which had caused him to resign his position on the Derby Committee. Dealing with the new Air Board he said that it would at length be able to lay down an air policy. He was delighted to see the names of Lord Curzon and Lord Sydenham on the new Board, and he hoped that Lord Curzon would be master in his own house. But he feared that all these proposed appeals to the Admiralty and War Office, to the War Committee, and, ultimately, to the Cabinet, would merely have the result of confronting Lord Curzon with the same men whose advisers had already disagreed with him. Nevertheless, he recognised that there had been a distinct improvement in the new staff. He admitted the difficulties of making large changes in war time, but he thought that as a rule it was better to be too early than too late. He believed that eventually a full-fledged Ministry would come out of the Air Board.

The motion was seconded by Lord Milner, and after a further speech by Lord Derby, Lord Crewe explained that there would be no question of Lord Curzon being out-voted on the Air Board. He pointed out that France had already tried an Air Ministry and abandoned it. In Germany the Services were not under any common authority, and, in short, the Government refused to accept the motion of Lord Montagu.

Lord Northcliffe, who spoke subsequently, expressed the view that aeroplanes were infinitely more important to us than to any other people in the world. He drew the attention of Lord Curzon's Board to three main points: The encouragement of inventors and the establishment of a special Board of Inventions; the encouragement of manufacturers; and, finally, increased provision for training flying men. He thought that it could not be expected that a great industry should be built

up in this country without financial assistance from the Government, and he advocated the German method whereby manufacturers specialised in separate parts of machines which were then assembled at central factories. With regard to the training of flying men, he urged that it should be taken in hand immediately, rather than be deferred to the winter when the physical difficulties would be much greater.

When the debate was renewed on the following day Lord Galway declared that Lord Northcliffe's suggestion that the new Air Board should start its own Board of Inventions had met with general approval. Lord Curzon expressed his thanks for the kind reception which had been given to the creation and composition of the Air Board, and expressed the opinion that the Air Service was one of which the nation had every reason to be proud. Referring to the Derby Committee, Lord Curzon described the alternatives which might possibly have been put in its place, including a reconstituted Derby Committee which would have been futile, or a reversion to the *status quo* which would have been inexpedient; although he thought that the War Office and Admiralty could have put up a much better defence of their administration than their critics believed. He observed that the reason for the rejection of a separate Air Department was because the Admiralty and War Office had been unable to reach the necessary measure of agreement. But he believed that an Air Ministry or Air Department was destined to come.

Lord Montagu in reply congratulated Lord Curzon, but took a less hopeful view as to his future relations with the Admiralty and War Office. He said that neither of the naval representatives had any technical knowledge, and General Henderson was already very much overworked. Most of the money spent on the war was for purely destructive purposes, but expenditure on aviation would accelerate its progress and thus benefit humanity in the future. Lord Montagu concluded by expressing his intention of dividing the House if another teller could be obtained, but as no other teller was forthcoming he was compelled to withdraw his motion and the debate came to an end.

The House of Commons was never free for very long from problems of finance; and on May 18, Mr. Chamberlain warmly defended the new Finance Bill on its second reading. He said that the present condition of our finances gave us a good assurance that we should be able to continue the struggle for as long as might be necessary. No other country had attempted to meet so much of the expense of the war by taxation as we were doing, and no other country was in a position to do so. He compared the effort made by this country and cheerfully borne by every class of society, with the effort made by Germany, who was raising 25,000,000*l.* towards the cost of the war as against our 300,000,000*l.* of additional taxation. The fact that the yield

of our new taxes exceeded the revenue estimated from them showed that we were not over-straining our resources. No one could say at the moment what would be the right fiscal policy to pursue after the war, but he held that agreement would at least be possible among sections who in the past had been widely separated.

A strong appeal was made by various members to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to issue Premium Bonds, their argument being that only by this method would it be possible to get great masses of the population to invest their money with the State. The expedient was opposed, however, by other members on the ground that it would damage our credit in foreign countries. After a considerable number of speeches Mr. McKenna emphatically rejected the proposal of Premium Bonds, on the ground that the working classes were already investing with the State as much as could be expected from them, and that the State had no desire to receive the profits of general gambling. He thought that in regard to the Excess Profits Tax he had already gone to the extreme point of safety, and he gave an undertaking that it would not be increased. As regards the Income Tax he promised to introduce modifications in Committee for the purpose of adjusting the proportion between earned and unearned incomes. The Bill was thereupon read a second time.

A few days later the House was called upon to consider the eleventh vote of credit introduced since the beginning of the war. Mr. Asquith introducing it estimated the rate of expenditure at 4,750,000*l.* a day; and the amount which he asked for was 300,000,000*l.*, which at this rate would suffice to carry on the Government until the first week in August. During the preceding fifty days Mr. Asquith put the daily rate of expenditure at 4,820,000*l.* During this period the following were the three chief items:—

(1) Army and Navy and Munitions	-	-	-	-	149,000,000 <i>l.</i>
(2) Loans to Allies and Dominions	-	-	-	-	74,500,000 <i>l.</i>
(3) Food Supplies, Railways, etc.	-	-	-	-	17,500,000 <i>l.</i>

He pointed out that the first item actually showed a slight diminution. The growth of expenditure had occurred almost entirely under the second head, and Mr. Asquith reminded the House and the country that one of the great contributions which we were making to the prosecution of the common cause was in the giving of financial assistance to our Allies and Dominions. He warned the House further that the Government could not hope for any sensible diminution in the near future in this expenditure.

Mr. Asquith was followed by Mr. Winston Churchill who devoted his speech to a survey of our resources in men. He said that we had five large reservoirs of men. The first was our Armies already in the field. He pointed to the immense number of officers and men in France and Flanders who never came under the fire of the enemy, and he suggested that the Army

had a large margin not yet usefully applied to the prosecution of the war. He calculated that while our total military effort might be 5,000,000 men, the actual force of the enemy with which we were in contact in effective rifle and artillery strength was about 500,000 men. Mr. Churchill's second reservoir was the Army at home. He asked if we really needed to keep such an immense number of men for training and drafting purposes. The employment of every man in uniform should be subjected to at least as severe a scrutiny as in the case of men not in uniform. The other three reservoirs were the Eastern Armies, Africa, and Asia. After a short debate the Vote of Credit was immediately agreed to.

Once again before the end of the month the House of Commons was called upon to consider an important financial proposal. On May 29 Mr. McKenna moved a resolution intended to form the basis of a Bill for the imposition of an extra Income Tax of 2s. in the pound in respect of the interest on American Securities which the owners had not sold or lent to the Treasury. The charge was to be assessed for the complete year, but would not become operative until July 1. In defence of this proposal Mr. McKenna described how by acquiring and using American securities held in this country the Government were able to meet that margin of liabilities in the United States which could not be met by the export of goods and gold, or by borrowing in America. For many months, he said, the securities had flowed in steadily, but in the last few weeks the stream had dwindled to a trickle. The explanation was not that the supply was exhausted but that many who owned the securities were inert. The new charge would be "a spur to remind them of their duty," and if it proved insufficient he would come to the House with a proposal to make it 5s., 10s., or even 20s. in the pound.

In reply to a question by Sir Edward Carson as to why it was not enacted at once that everybody should give in his securities, the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied that compulsion would mean the flooding of the Treasury with securities which they would be unable to sell. One or two members criticised the proposal somewhat severely, but Mr. Churchill reminded them that we were at war and that too great a straining for equality of sacrifice might end in equality of ruin. Ultimately, the resolution was agreed to without a division.

We must now turn back to record the political events following the Irish rebellion. In the course of a debate in the House of Lords on May 10, Lord Crewe announced the resignation of the Lord-Lieutenant and stated that a Commission of Inquiry had been appointed, consisting of Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, Sir Montague Shearman, a Judge of the High Court, and Sir Mackenzie Chalmers. The discussion arose out of an attack upon the Government by Lord Loreburn who moved a resolution expressing profound dissatisfaction with the administration of affairs in Ireland. He claimed that it was the duty

of Parliament, even in the midst of a great war, to examine a question of this kind. Experience had already shown the danger of Parliamentary silence carried to excess. Secrecy had gone too far, he said, in regard to the war, and in this matter Parliament was partly to blame for having abstained from examining the subject of Ireland, as it had been to blame in refusing to take seriously the Dardanelles, and in passing over without serious criticism Mesopotamia and the lack of munitions. Lord Loreburn went on to affirm that the Government had neglected the elementary duty of all Governments, the protection of peaceable citizens, for it was notorious that the Sinn-Feiners were armed and had paraded publicly, and conducted sham fights in preparation for the real fight. Any Government should have been prepared by all that had preceded the insurrection, and yet there were insufficient troops in or near Dublin to protect the populace when the outbreak came. Other Ministers must have known as well as Mr. Birrell what was going forward, and one Minister alone ought not to be made a scapegoat. Parliament was entitled to know the names of those who were at fault, and he hoped that the promised inquiry would be public.

Lord Midleton supported the indictment of Lord Loreburn by relating visits which he had repeatedly made to the Lord-Lieutenant, the Chief Secretary, the Under-Secretary, and the Prime Minister himself, in the course of which he had produced documentary and other evidence of the seditious objects of the Sinn-Feiners. If his advice, given at those interviews, had been adopted, he said, there would have been no insurrection. His suggestions were that Trial by Jury should be suspended and military trial substituted; that the Irish Volunteers should be suppressed and their arms confiscated; and that all persons connected with the Sinn-Fein movement should be dismissed from the public service.

Lord Crewe in his reply accused Lord Loreburn of having lost his sense of proportion in his attack upon the Government, and appealed to the House to refrain from discussing the Irish insurrection until the Commission had reported. This appeal, notwithstanding that it was supported by Lord Bryce, was ignored, and the debate was continued by Lord Desart, Lord Oranmore, and Lord Donoughmore, the two latter expressing cordial regret at Lord Wimborne's resignation.

The debate was continued on the following day, when Lord Beresford declared that Mr. Birrell was responsible for turning a peaceful country into one seething with sedition. He hoped that the silence and secrecy observed by the Government with reference to Ireland would not lead to a similar result in Glasgow, where sedition was also being preached. The reply of Lord Crewe on the previous day was then supplemented by a further answer from Lord Lansdowne, who affirmed that he was one of those who took a grave view of the insurrection. It had only been through the prompt action of the Military that

we had escaped a disaster, the extent of which it was impossible to conjecture. If the rebellion, he said, had not miscarried at the outset, all the restless spirits throughout the country would have flocked to the rebel standard. He regarded the motion as a vote of censure on the Irish Executive and the Government. The leading members of the Executive had resigned, and their conduct was to be inquired into by the Commission. He accepted the joint responsibility of the Cabinet, but thought that the right course would be to wait for the facts established by the Commission before putting the Government on its trial. Lord Midleton, he added, should have brought his warnings to his old colleagues in the Cabinet as well as to the Prime Minister. The Government had decided to dismiss all Sinn-Feiners from the public service, and to retain martial law so long as General Maxwell considered it to be necessary.

Lord Halsbury next expressed his dissatisfaction with the defence of Lord Crewe and Lord Lansdowne. He insisted that the Cabinet should say how much they knew and what was going on in Ireland, and whether they had approved or disapproved of Mr. Birrell's policy. The Government were upon their trial; they must answer now, and he refused to admit any plea for delay. It was all very well to "wait and see," but they had waited and seen Dublin in ruins; and murder, sedition, and high treason rampant in Ireland.

After Lord MacDonnell had expressed regret that Lord Bryce had not retained the Irish Chief Secretaryship from 1907 onwards, Lord Salisbury resumed the indictment of the Government, saying that when the Unionist members of the Coalition joined the Government they appeared to have accepted the state of affairs as they found them, including Mr. Birrell and Mr. Birrell's government of Ireland. He considered it the duty of the House of Lords not to shrink from public discussion, for those who had allowed Mr. Churchill to gamble with the Empire in the Dardanelles and Mr. Birrell to produce rebellion in Ireland were still in power. Lord Cromer then said that he would certainly go into the Lobby if necessary with Lord Loreburn to express his own profound dissatisfaction with the whole administration of Ireland. It was all very well for Mr. Birrell to stand in a white sheet, but could he give the country back the precious lives which had been sacrificed by his neglect and culpable optimism? At the end of this discussion the motion was carried without a division.

Meanwhile, discussion in the House of Commons had turned upon the executions of the rebels which were taking place in Ireland. On May 10 a large number of questions on this subject were addressed to Mr. Asquith, especially with reference to the death of Mr. Sheehy Skeffington, a Dublin journalist. Mr. Asquith refused to undertake that no more military executions would take place in Ireland. Skeffington, he said, had been shot on April 26 without the knowledge of the Military Au-

thorities; and the officer who had directed the shooting would be tried by court-martial. Mr. Dillon, however, remained dissatisfied and obtained leave to move the adjournment of the House on the following day for the purpose of discussing the military executions.

Accordingly on May 11, Mr. Dillon, in the course of his speech, declared that Mr. Asquith was being kept in the dark as to secret shootings and imprisonments in military barracks in Ireland, and that Dublin was being maddened by rumours of such massacres. He accused the Government and the soldiers of washing out the lifework of the Nationalists in a "sea of blood." Mr. Dillon declared that he was proud of the rebels. He urged the Government to keep in mind the example of General Botha, and read a statement made by Mrs. Sheehy Skeffington as to the death of her husband, in which charges were made against certain officers and soldiers.

Mr. Asquith in his reply defended General Sir John Maxwell and the troops under his command, reminding the House that only thirteen rebels had been executed. Apart from one execution for murder, it was only the leaders of the rising who had been subjected to the extreme penalty; there were two more such leaders awaiting death, but that would complete the tale of the condemned insurrectionists, and in any other case of murder there would be a public trial. He suggested that the rank and file of the rebels would be "given an opportunity of redeeming what was in their case a venial and more or less pardonable error." Finally, Mr. Asquith announced his intention of going to Ireland that same evening to consult the Civil and Military Authorities with a view to arriving at some arrangement for the future Government of Ireland, that would commend itself to Irishmen of all parties, and to the House of Commons. In the course of this debate it was mentioned that in addition to the 521 casualties among the military and police during the rising, the casualties among the civil population amounted to 273, of which number 180 had been killed.

Mr. Asquith's visit to Ireland was the subject of much speculation; but the conclusions at which he might have arrived were kept secret until he himself was able to make an announcement in the House of Commons on May 25. It had been anticipated that the Prime Minister would take this opportunity of making a detailed statement on the military aspect of the Irish situation, but he did nothing of the kind. He declared that the primary duty of the Government was to restore order and to prevent the possibility of the recurrence of disorder; if martial law was continued as a precautionary measure, he hoped that its disappearance would be speedy and complete. He had, he said, returned from Ireland with two dominant impressions: (1) the breakdown of the existing machinery of Irish Government; (2) the strength and depth, almost the universality of the feeling in Ireland that we now

had a unique opportunity for a new departure for the settlement of outstanding problems, and for a combined effort to obtain an agreement as to the way in which the Government of Ireland was for the future to be carried on. The Prime Minister added that it was inconceivable that after the war, with its joint sacrifice from Englishmen and Irishmen, there should be domestic strife in Ireland. It would be a confession of bankruptcy, not only of statesmanship but of patriotism. The Home Rule Act was on the Statute Book, but nobody had ever contemplated its coercive application by one set of Irishmen to another. Could there not be an agreement between the different interests and parties in Ireland? He assured the House that the Government were anxious to do all in their power to secure such a result. He then made the principal announcement of his speech, which was to the effect that Mr. Lloyd George had undertaken, at the unanimous request of his colleagues, to devote his time and energy to the promotion of an Irish settlement. To that end Mr. Lloyd George had already put himself in communication with the various exponents of the views of the various Irish parties.

This announcement appeared to be received with general satisfaction by all parties. Mr. Redmond recognised that the new effort of the Government had been placed in able and energetic hands, and declared that if it failed, it would not be the fault of him and his friends. Sir Edward Carson also expressed his adhesion to the requests of the Prime Minister.

Once again before the Whitsuntide recess, the House of Commons had before them the Irish question. Mr. Dillon then expressed a less sanguine view of Mr. Lloyd George's mission than that which prevailed elsewhere, and asked for guarantees with reference to the treatment of the Irish prisoners detained in Great Britain and the holding of further court-martials in Ireland. Mr. Asquith, in reply, laid it down as the rule to be followed that all prisoners should be treated with the utmost leniency and released as speedily as possible, except those who were concerned directly or indirectly in the rising, or in the preparation for it, and those whose return to Ireland at the present moment might be a source of danger to the country. He said that approximately 800 had been released already and that the Government were taking every possible step to accelerate the discharge of prisoners whose innocence was presumptive. He defended the action of the Government in keeping the men in temporary detention and giving them an appeal to a Judicial Committee to which one or two persons of Irish experience and knowledge would be added.

It now remains only to record debates on various promiscuous subjects which took place before the House of Commons arose for the Whitsuntide recess. The first, though perhaps not the most important of these debates, arose out of a motion by Mr. Ponsonby calling for the initiation of peace negotiations.

He argued that, if the diplomatic trimmings were taken away, there was no substantial difference between the German Chancellor and the British Foreign Secretary which would justify the continuation of the war. Both he and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald suggested that the hands of the British Government were tied in some way by obligations which we had undertaken to our Allies. In reply Sir Edward Grey reminded the House that the Allies had bound themselves not to put forward any terms of peace except in common. As to the causes of the war, Sir Edward again insisted that the war might have been avoided if his suggestion for a conference had been adopted. It was not adopted because there was not goodwill, but the failure was not ours. He could not agree that the interview with the German Chancellor which had lately been reported, or that the Chancellor's speech of the previous month, showed the disposition for peace which had been claimed for them. The only new point in the interview was the statement about the bellicose attitude of the British Government at the time of the Bosnian difficulty; and that was a first-class lie, supplied, presumably, out of the familiar German laboratory. Sir Edward Grey went on to say that he read the interview to mean that those who were not willing to accept the German terms were responsible for the continuance of the war. He insisted that the real thing which was responsible for prolonging the war more than anything else, was that the German Government was telling the people that they had won and that the Allies had been beaten; but the Allies had not been beaten, and the first step towards peace would be when the German Government began to recognise that fact. He referred to the sacrifices of the French Army at Verdun which were saving France and her Allies; and asked whether this was a moment for us to do anything but concentrate upon expressing our determination to give the fullest support in our power to those Allies.

The debate on the vote for the Board of Agriculture which took place on May 22 was chiefly notable for a grave statement by Mr. Acland on behalf of the Board, directing attention to the danger of a breakdown in the home production of food owing to the withdrawal of men from the land for the Army. Mr. Acland said that the Labour Exchanges were supplying a certain number of workers to take the place of farm hands on military service. The employment of children over 12 also gave some relief, and it was hoped that by arrangements with the War Office soldiers would be permitted this year, as they were last year, to help in harvesting the hay and corn. He said that agriculture must depend on women's work. If the farmers would meet this view half way, and if the Tribunals would spare the skilled men, the situation would be saved. Among the other points of Mr. Acland's speech were the announcements that 500 German prisoners were about to be employed in felling timber for trench and other naval and military uses, and that the

inroads which were necessary on our native timber during the war made the development of a comprehensive national forestry policy at the earliest moment after the war a matter of the first importance.

Mr. Prothero urged the Government to grapple immediately with the problem of the food supply and to put the nation on rations at once, instead of waiting until they were compelled to do so. He also suggested that horses should be placed on rations in order to economise the hay supplies, and that Conscientious Objectors should be set to work on the land.

On the last day of May a debate on the organisation of the Army was initiated by Mr. Winston Churchill, who contended that there was great inefficiency, and waste of men and money. His main points were that only half the strength of the Army was abroad; of that half, half fought and half did not fight; of the half that fought, about three-quarters fought as infantry in the trenches and almost all the loss fell upon them; of every six men who were taken from the nation at one end, one effective infantry rifle was produced over the parapet at the other; and there were two million men who had been recruited who had never heard the sound of a bullet. Mr. Churchill drew two conclusions from this calculation; the first was that with this vast mass of fighting men on the pay list the comparatively small fighting units at the front ought never to have been allowed to fall below strength; the second was that search would reveal hundreds of thousands of men in the prime of military life available to reinforce and relieve the war-worn battalions in the trenches.

In reply to this speech Mr. McKenna said that he had obtained from the Adjutant-General a report on the way in which every man was employed, and this report contradicted the suggestion of wastage. Nevertheless, Major-General Sir Ivor Herbert proceeded to move a reduction of Lord Kitchener's salary, urging that the Minister for War had failed to foresee our need in munitions, and to prevent what was virtually a breakdown of our recruiting machinery. This charge was immediately repudiated by Mr. Asquith, who declared that the Army, the Country, and the Empire were under a debt, which could not be measured in words, to Lord Kitchener for the services he had rendered in the war. He insisted that nobody but Lord Kitchener could have summoned into existence so enormous an army in so short a time with so little friction. Ultimately Sir Ivor Herbert's motion was negatived after Mr. Tennant had announced that Lord Kitchener would be pleased to confer with any members who might wish to see him or make suggestions to him.

On the following day the House of Commons adjourned for the Whitsuntide recess. Before doing so Mr. Asquith rose to request that all those in munition areas, both munition workers proper and others, should defer their Whitsun holiday until

later in the year. He announced the intention of the Government to proclaim the postponement of the Whit-Monday holiday until Tuesday, August 8. He explained that the Government after taking into consideration the very urgent need for a continuous and increasing supply of munitions of war, had come to the conclusion that it was necessary in the national interest that all holidays, both the general Whitsun holiday and any special local holidays, should be deferred in munition areas until after the end of July. He hoped that the suspension of the holiday would be as general as possible. In point of fact, after some discussion among workers in the country, the postponement of the holiday was universally accepted.

On June 5 there occurred what was perhaps the greatest disaster suffered by the country in the course of the year. Lord Kitchener, on the invitation of the Tsar of Russia, left the north of England on that day in H.M.S. *Hampshire*. At about 8 o'clock in the evening, the *Hampshire* struck a mine to the west of the Orkneys and sank. She had been accompanied on her voyage by two destroyers up to about an hour before the explosion occurred, but they had then been detached owing to the very heavy seas which were running. The ship sank within ten minutes. Destroyers and patrol vessels were immediately despatched to the scene, but in spite of every measure that could be taken, the boats which put off from the *Hampshire* were wrecked and lost, and only twelve survivors reached the shore on a raft.

The death of Lord Kitchener was deeply felt by all parties and persons throughout the Empire. On June 13 a memorial service was held at St. Paul's Cathedral at which the King and Queen were present; other services being held at Westminster Abbey and in various parts of the country. On the re-opening of Parliament the first concern of both Houses was to place on record their sense of the great loss which the country had sustained. In the House of Lords, Lord French related Lord Kitchener's unsparing efforts to supply all his demands while he was Commander-in-Chief of the Army in France. So high was his estimate of Lord Kitchener as a soldier that when he was originally selected for the chief command in the field, he had urged Lord Kitchener to see the Prime Minister and arrange to take his place, Lord French himself acting as Chief-of-the-Staff. In the House of Commons on the following day a resolution was moved by Mr. Asquith and seconded by Mr. Bonar Law that a national monument be erected to Lord Kitchener, and after numerous tributes to his character, both as a soldier and a man, the resolution was agreed to.

During the recess two important speeches were made on the progress of the war. The first of these was by Mr. Balfour who addressed the British Imperial Council of Commerce on June 7 on the results of the recent battle of Jutland. He said that it was a profound mistake to imagine that the opposing naval

forces were left in the same relative strength after as before the battle. The Germans were now relatively far inferior to what they had been before the battle, and he believed that neither in the North Sea nor in the Baltic could they for many months make the kind of organised fleet effort which might have been in their power previously. The other speech was delivered by the Prime Minister to his constituents on June 14. It was notable for his expression of opinion that the relations between the various parts of the Empire would have to be remodelled after the war, for it was not to be expected that the Dominions would again support us in a war which they had had no part in declaring. Mr. Asquith confirmed Mr. Balfour's point of view of the Jutland battle which he considered to have been a great victory for this country.

At length in the middle of June there met at Paris the Economic Conference which had been anticipated and discussed for so many weeks beforehand. The meetings began on June 14 and lasted four days, the conclusions arrived at being published by the Board of Trade on June 20. The delegates were received by M. Briand at the French Foreign Office. He said that in addition to the military union and to the diplomatic union which had already been formed, we now had an economic union which would guarantee the intensive development of our material resources. The conclusions reached by the Conference were divided into three parts, the first dealing with the period of war, the second with the period of reconstruction following the war, and the third with the permanent period of peace which it was hoped would ultimately supervene. As regards the war period, the recommendations of the Conference included the co-ordination of the laws and regulations in the Allied countries prohibiting trading with the enemy, an absolute embargo on the importation of goods originating in or coming from enemy countries, the sequestration or control of businesses owned or operated by enemy subjects, and finally stringent measures for the restriction of enemy supplies.

The recommendations for the reconstruction period included the devising of joint means to secure to countries suffering from acts of destruction and unjust requisition, the restoration of their raw materials, industrial and agricultural plant, stock, and mercantile fleet, or to assist them to re-equip themselves in these respects. It was further proposed that for a period to be fixed by agreement most-favoured-nation treatment should be denied to the enemy powers, that arrangements should be made between the Allied countries for conservation and interchange of our national resources, and finally that protective measures against enemy dumping should be taken, as also for preventing enemy subjects in Allied countries from engaging in industries which concerned national defence or economic independence.

As regards the peace period, the Conference recommended that measures should be taken to render the Allied countries

independent of enemy countries in raw materials and manufactured articles essential to the normal development of their economic activities, to facilitate and improve the interchange of their products, and finally to assimilate the laws governing patents, indications of origin and trade-marks, and for the adoption of an identical procedure in regard to patents, trade-marks, and literary and artistic copyright which had come into existence in enemy countries during the war.

The recommendations of the Conference were received with considerable enthusiasm by the majority of the political parties in the House of Commons. A small minority only regretted the recommendations in so far as they concerned the measures to be taken after the conclusion of the war. They deprecated what they considered to be the carrying on of war after peace had been declared. Nevertheless, the importance attached to these recommendations throughout the greater part of the country was emphasised in speeches made on June 23 by Mr. Bonar Law, Lord Rosebery, Lord Grey, and others at a great dinner given to Mr. Hughes. Mr. Bonar Law expressed the view that the resolutions of the Paris Conference would be adopted not only by the present Government but by the present House of Commons, and that they might be taken as representing the settled policy of the British Government. The same opinion was expressed by most of the other speakers including Mr. Hughes himself, whose name by this time carried immense weight throughout the country. Little more remains to be said for the present as to the results of the Paris Conference. On June 24 Mr. Hughes brought to a conclusion his eventful visit to England, and sailed for Australia to initiate there the campaign in favour of conscription, which will be found recorded in the section dealing with that Dominion.

Parliament reopened on June 20, and after the resolutions in connexion with the name of Lord Kitchener, the first business of the House of Commons was to deal in Committee with the Finance Bill which embodied the chief proposals of Mr. McKenna's Budget. A number of concessions to public opinion were then announced. The proposed duty on cocoa was reduced from 6*d.* to 4½*d.* a lb. With regard to tinder-boxes, the duty of 5*s.* on each article was withdrawn with a view to establishing a new and lower scale later on. The increased duty on motor-car licences was also withdrawn. With regard to petrol, it was announced that limited supplies only would be allowed to purchasers; such supplies being regulated by the issue of permits and subject to a special licence duty of 6*d.* a gallon, commercial cars and doctors' cars to pay half rates. In the case of income tax it was conceded that the allowance for children might be claimed on an income of 700*l.* instead of 500*l.* A concession was also made to soldiers and sailors who were relieved of the higher rate of income tax for incomes up to 1,500*l.*

On the subject of cocoa Mr. McKenna explained that the

object of the Government was to impose precisely the same charge as upon tea. Their conclusion was that the true relation was $4\frac{1}{2}d.$ a lb. on cocoa, $4\frac{1}{2}d.$ on raw coffee, and 1s. on tea. Mr. Lough hereupon endeavoured to secure the abolition of the new duty of a $\frac{1}{2}d.$ on sugar, but Mr. McKenna withstood this demand and even warned the House that sugar would probably become dearer. The scheme for the limitation of the sale of petrol was described by Mr. Montagu, who stated that there was to be a central control of petrol stocks which were to be distributed to consumers under permits; each consumer would be entitled to purchase a specified number of gallons for a specified purpose and for a specified period.

On the resumption of the debate on the following day, efforts were made to modify the huge impost on Dollar Securities; but Mr. McKenna declined to yield, reminding the critics that under the Defence of the Realm Act every kind of property could be commandeered for the purposes of the country at prices far below those paid for Dollar Securities. Considerable time was then taken up with a discussion of the question of munitions and excess profits, but Mr. McKenna again refused to modify his proposals. Sir Alfred Mond expressed the view that controlled establishments would prefer to be under excess profits rather than under controlled establishment profits, but they were willing to accept either solution. They objected, however, to excess profits being levied in addition to that upon controlled establishments. An amendment moved to this effect enlisted the support of seventy-two members against the Government.

We have now to go back some weeks and resume the thread of affairs following the Irish Rebellion. The Royal Commission, appointed to inquire into the causes of the insurrection and the conduct of the Civil and Military Authorities, held its first meeting on May 18, and continued to take evidence almost daily to the end of the month. During June the Royal Commission sat at intervals and its report was published on July 3, within seven weeks of its appointment. In the course of this report the Commissioners described the constitution of the Irish Executive in so far as it was concerned with the maintenance of law and order. They reviewed the legal power vested in the Executive, and finally they related the history of the events which led up to the outbreak on Easter Monday. The origin and growth of the Irish Volunteers were traced from the time of the arming of industrial strikers in Dublin in the winter of 1913. Many remarkable quotations were given from confidential reports by the heads of the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Metropolitan Police to show that even before the outbreak of war full knowledge of the state of affairs was supplied to the Irish Government. This information concerned especially the growth of a disloyal body of armed men whose seditious campaign was becoming a constantly increasing menace to peace in Ireland.

The Commissioners sharply criticised the Government policy

of inaction in the face of these repeated warnings, and said that even at the risk of a collision early steps should have been taken to arrest and prosecute the leaders of sedition. They acquitted the Lord-Lieutenant (Lord Wimborne) of responsibility, and expressed the opinion that the Chief Secretary (Mr. Birrell) was primarily responsible for the situation that was allowed to arise, and for the outbreak. "The main cause of the rebellion," they said, "appears to be that lawlessness was allowed to grow up unchecked; and that Ireland, for several years past, has been administered on the principle that it was safer and more expedient to leave law in abeyance if collision with any faction of the Irish people could thereby be avoided." They added that, "such a policy is the negation of that cardinal rule of Government, which demands that the enforcement of the law and the preservation of order should always be independent of political expediency." Although fastening responsibility upon Mr. Birrell, the Commissioners remarked that the policy of the Chief Secretary was the policy of the British Government as a whole. They credited Sir Matthew Nathan, the Under-Secretary, with complete loyalty to the Government policy, but expressed the opinion that he had not sufficiently impressed on Mr. Birrell the need of more active measures to put down sedition.

If the Government were thus convicted of weakness before the rebellion, no such charge could be brought against the action which they took after the outbreak. The executions of the rebel leaders have already been referred to, but Sir Roger Casement, the main instigator, was placed upon his trial in the Civil Courts. The preliminary hearing of the charge of High Treason against him was opened at Bow Street Police Court on May 15, when there appeared beside him in the dock a soldier of the Royal Irish Rifles, named Daniel Julian Bailey, who was alleged to have joined the "Irish Brigade" raised in Germany and had accompanied Sir Roger in his recent expedition to the coast of Kerry. The two prisoners were committed for trial on May 17, and a week later a Grand Jury in the High Court found a true bill in each case on the indictments charging the two prisoners with High Treason. The trial of Sir Roger Casement began on June 26, the indictment charging him with "adhering to the King's enemies elsewhere than in the King's Realm, to wit, in the Empire of Germany." After a trial of four days, he was convicted of High Treason and sentenced to death. From the beginning there never could be any doubt as to his guilt, although he was defended with conspicuous ability by Mr. Serjeant A. M. Sullivan, K.C., of the Irish Bar. It was not denied that Casement had gone to Germany, and that, with the connivance and assistance of the German authorities, he had endeavoured to seduce from their allegiance the King's Irish soldiers in captivity there. The defence was set up that he had only asked them to join an Irish Brigade in order to resist the Ulster Volunteers at the end of the war, but this defence

was of no avail; nor did it serve his case to cite an ancient Act of the reign of Edward III., which appeared to indicate that the offence of High Treason could not be committed except within the King's dominions.

The establishment of Sir Roger Casement's guilt was followed on June 30 by an announcement that the King had issued orders that he should be degraded from his degree of Knight Bachelor and from the Order of St. Michael and St. George, to which he had been appointed in 1905. Casement appealed against his conviction, but after a sitting of two days the appeal was dismissed by the Court of Criminal Appeal, and he was finally hanged in Pentonville Gaol on August 3rd.

Meanwhile the negotiations for a settlement of the Irish problem continued to make slow progress. It will be remembered that Mr. Asquith, immediately after returning from the scene of the outrage on May 25, had spoken in the House of Commons of "the breakdown of the existing machinery of Irish Government and of an unique opportunity for a new departure." The matter had thereupon been delivered over to the hands of Mr. Lloyd George for the purpose of finding some satisfactory settlement. The first intimation as to what Mr. Lloyd George's proposals might be was made by Mr. John Redmond to a meeting of the Irish Parliamentary Party in Dublin on June 10. Mr. Redmond stated that the Prime Minister had returned from his recent visit to Ireland profoundly convinced that the system known as Castle Government had completely broken down, and that the only alternative to a long period of Military Government was the early creation of an Irish Government. Accordingly, the proposals of Mr. Lloyd George were:—

1. To bring the Home Rule Act into immediate operation.
2. To introduce at once an Amending Bill to cover only the period of the war and a short interval after it. During this interval the Irish Members were to remain at Westminster in their full numbers, and the six Ulster Counties were to be left under the Imperial Government as at present. Mr. Redmond mentioned also one or two other subsidiary proposals.

These proposals were considered by the Ulster Unionist Council on June 12. The delegates of the Counties met separately and in private; and subsequently full authority was given to Sir Edward Carson to continue and complete the negotiations initiated by Mr. Lloyd George on the basis of the definite exclusion from the Home Rule Act of the six Counties of Antrim, Down, Derry, Armagh, Tyrone, and Fermanagh, together with the cities of Belfast, Londonderry, and Newry. The Ulster Unionist Council reaffirmed its unabated abhorrence of the policy of Home Rule, but in view of the supreme urgency of the situation they were prepared to subordinate their local patriotism to Imperial necessity. Mr. Devlin subsequently persuaded his Nationalist followers in Belfast to agree to the

proposals. A convention of Nationalists from the six Counties proposed to be excluded met in Belfast on June 23 and voted by 475 votes against 265 in favour of accepting the policy of exclusion. It thus appeared for a time that agreement would at length be reached on this critical problem, but it soon became apparent that grave differences were still outstanding. The Unionists of the three southern provinces made no effort to conceal their disappointment; and their views were echoed both in the House of Commons and the Cabinet. Lord Selborne's resignation was announced on June 25, and for a time it was believed that Mr. Long would also leave the Cabinet. A deputation of over fifty Irish Unionists waited on the Unionist Members of the Cabinet on June 26 for the purpose of entering a protest against what they described as a scheme for the Government of Ireland which would be regarded as a reward for rebellion, and which they considered would be gravely dangerous. On the following day the same deputation was received by the Prime Minister and by Mr. Lloyd George; and their efforts were in so far successful as to cause the postponement of a meeting which had been arranged of the Unionist Members of the House of Commons, in order to allow the Government further time for the consideration of their proposals.

On June 27 Lord Selborne explained in the House of Lords the reasons which had led him to resign his office. He began by urging the view that although Mr. Lloyd George was necessarily entrusted with large freedom of action, he was not a plenipotentiary. Lord Selborne had understood that the basis of the Irish inquiry was an amendment of the Home Rule Act by the exclusion of Ulster, to be brought into operation at the restoration of peace; but he had learnt during the Whitsuntide recess that the proposed settlement contemplated the bringing of the Act with modifications into operation during the war. He had immediately informed the Prime Minister that he could take no responsibility for such a policy. His reason for dissenting from this solution was that, although he would have been perfectly ready for such a settlement immediately after the termination of the war, he was not prepared to advise his Majesty that the Act or some travesty of it could wisely or safely be brought into operation during the war. Ireland he said was in a gravely disturbed condition, and in his judgment it would be more perilous to inaugurate a constitutional change of such magnitude during the war than any other course open to the Government.

In the course of a debate on the Irish situation in the House of Lords on June 29, Lord Lansdowne, who had also been spoken of as being on the point of resignation, stated that the proposals had not yet been disposed of by the Cabinet, and that points of vital importance were still under consideration. He affirmed that the Government were in no way bound by Mr.

Lloyd George's consultations, nor did they accept any responsibility for the details. He assured the House that before the Government made any proposals they would have to satisfy Parliament that they were adequate, having regard to the condition of Ireland and to the course which they might think it necessary to take to prevent a recurrence of these lamentable disasters.

On July 4 Mr. Long held a meeting at the Local Government Board with sixty-four Unionist Members of the House of Commons and six Peers, all avowed opponents of the proposed settlement. At length it was stated that the Cabinet had reached an agreement, and that Mr. Long had withdrawn his threatened resignation: whereupon the deferred meeting of Unionist Members of the House of Commons at the Carlton Club was fixed for July 7. The views actually expressed at that meeting were not published, but it was understood that the minority who resisted the advice of the Unionist leaders to accept the settlement had every opportunity for the freest expression of their opinions. After these many weeks of discussion and negotiations, the subject was at length sufficiently matured to permit of a statement by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons on July 10.

Mr. Asquith began by explaining how the negotiations proceeding on the basis of immediate Home Rule, with the six Ulster Counties excluded, gradually advanced towards agreement. He was able to announce that all his colleagues were now willing to share the responsibility of recommending the House to accept Mr. Lloyd George's proposals. The chief points in those proposals were as follows:—

1. The Home Rule Act was to be brought into operation as soon as possible after Parliament's sanction had been given to the exclusion from its operation of the six Counties and the three Parliamentary Boroughs already named.

2. The main changes contemplated in the existing Act apart from those consequential on the exclusion of the six Counties were two. The Irish House of Commons was to consist of the persons who were for the time being members returned by the same constituencies in Ireland to serve in the Imperial Parliament; and the Appeal Court in Dublin was to consist of Judges appointed by the Imperial Executive.

3. It was to be made clear that the Irish Executive could not encroach in any way on the undivided power and responsibility of the Imperial Authority in all that appertained to the successful prosecution of the war.

4. The Bill in which these proposals were to be embodied was to remain in force during the war and for twelve months after it.

Having outlined these proposals the Prime Minister commented on the fact that the dissentient Unionists of the South and West of Ireland had suggested no alternative course,

although they had been invited by Mr. Lloyd George to do so. Sir Edward Carson, referring to the Prime Minister's statement that the arrangement was to be provisional, asked if the six Ulster Counties would be definitely struck out of the Act. To this question Mr. Asquith replied in the affirmative, adding that they could not again be included without a fresh Bill.

This very general statement by Mr. Asquith was supplemented next day by a far more detailed account from Lord Lansdowne in the House of Lords. In the course of that debate the new Irish tendencies of the Government were strongly attacked by Lord Midleton who expressed the belief that there would be more bloodshed in Ireland if the proposed sham Parliament were set up, than if it were denied during the period of the war. Lord Wimborne, the late Lord-Lieutenant, affirmed that the Irish Executive had at least two fatal defects, division of responsibility and duality of aim. He asserted that they might treat Ireland as a Crown Colony or throw upon her the responsibility for governing herself, but between these two extremes no middle course was practicable. Thereupon Lord Lansdowne announced the policy which the Government intended to pursue during the transition from the military rule of the present to the projected self-government of the future. He said that, while Sir John Maxwell enjoyed the unabated confidence of the Government, we could not look forward for an indefinite period to leaving the country as it was at present. The Government hoped to be able to appoint an Irish Minister responsible to Parliament, although no doubt there would have to be associated with him a military officer with forces sufficient to maintain unquestioned order. Lord Lansdowne expressed the intention of the Government to strengthen if necessary the Defence of the Realm Act, and he denied that they had in view the granting of a general amnesty to prisoners. A new Order in Council was about to be issued for the prohibition of the carrying of military arms without a permit.

Lord Lansdowne's description of the Irish policy of the Government caused considerable annoyance to the Nationalists, being described by Mr. Redmond as a gross insult to Ireland and tantamount to a declaration of war on the Irish people and to the announcement of a policy of coercion. Mr. Redmond drew attention especially to Lord Lansdowne's statement that the proposed Amending Bill would make structural alterations in the Act of 1914, and would therefore be permanent and enduring in its character. He said that he adhered strictly to the agreement reached with Mr. Lloyd George, and that any departure from that agreement in the direction of Lord Lansdowne's suggestion would bring the negotiations absolutely to an end. The dissentient Unionists on the other hand met on July 17 and passed a Resolution welcoming the assurance of Lord Lansdowne that it was the intention of the Government to take all necessary steps to repress treason and sedition in Ireland.

At length on July 24 Mr. Redmond asked the Prime Minister in the House of Commons whether it was true that the Government had determined to insert in their draft Bill new proposals at variance with the Lloyd George agreement, adding at the same time that any Bill so framed would be vigorously opposed by his party. In reply Mr. Asquith stated that the Government could not agree to the retention of the Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament in undiminished numbers, as provided by the agreement, after the next election. He said also that the Government would not introduce any Bill unless the parties were substantially agreed. Thereupon Mr. Redmond straightway asked permission to move the adjournment of the House to call attention to the "deplorable effect" on the Irish situation of the refusal of the Government to carry out the terms of the agreement.

When this debate came on later in the evening, Mr. Redmond informed the Government that the course on which they had embarked was bound to increase Irish suspicion of the good faith of British statesmen, to inflame feeling in Ireland, and to do serious mischief to those high imperial interests which were said to necessitate a provisional settlement of this question. He and his colleagues could not agree to new proposals which would involve a disgraceful breach of faith on their part towards their supporters in Ireland. Finally, he warned the Government that although his attitude with regard to the war remained unaltered, he and his friends would consider it their duty to exercise an independent judgment henceforward in criticising the procrastination of Ministers, not only with regard to Ireland but with regard to the whole conduct of the war.

Mr. Lloyd George then attempted to pour oil on the troubled waters. He contended that the difficulty which had arisen over the exclusion of the Ulster Counties was purely a matter of words. He agreed that the exclusion was to be provisional, and was to be reviewed at the end of the war by an Imperial Conference. He admitted that the agreement had been departed from in the matter of the retention of the Irish Members, and that this alteration was due to pressure from the Unionist Members of the Cabinet. Finally, he told the Nationalists that it would be impossible for the Government to bring the Home Rule Act into operation during the war except on the conditions which the Prime Minister had announced. Sir Edward Carson then expressed the point of view of Ulster. He said that throughout the negotiations he had thought of nothing else than the war, and he repudiated the idea that there could be any question of the coercion of Ulster. It would be a calamity if the hopes which in recent weeks had been raised in Ireland were now to fail. After the war the Home Rule Act would be on the Statute Book, and old quarrels must not be resumed. At the end of the debate Mr. Asquith refused to accept the position that all hopes of agreement had broken down. He denied that

there had been any breach of faith, and closed with an appeal to all sides to endeavour to bring about an agreement which would redound in the long run to the good of Ireland and to the safety and strength of the Empire.

Notwithstanding this appeal it was plain that the negotiations had hopelessly broken down and could not be revived. On July 31, Mr. Dillon moved a Resolution calling upon the Government to disclose immediately their plans for the future Government of Ireland, during the continuance of the war. In the course of his speech he charged the Unionist Members of the Cabinet with being ready to break the settlement on the question of the Irish representation at Westminster, which the Nationalists regarded as fundamental; and he sought to prove that the prevention of the settlement was mainly due to Lord Lansdowne. He declared that the system of military rule under Sir John Maxwell had done more to spread disaffection in Ireland than all the organisers of Sinn Féin.

In the course of his reply Mr. Asquith repudiated the suggestion that any special responsibility attached to Lord Lansdowne for the decision of the Cabinet on the retention of the Irish Members at Westminster. He hoped to make arrangements with the Treasury for a substantial loan to the Corporation of Dublin towards the rebuilding of the destroyed areas. The problem before the House was that of providing the machinery of Government in Ireland for a purely temporary period. Martial Law, he said, proclaimed as a precautionary measure, had not been enforced in practice, and he hoped that it might be possible before long to discard even the form of it. He paid a tribute to Sir John Maxwell's administration, while expressing the view that the military forces in Ireland could not be substantially reduced. Still it was the opinion of the Government that there should be a Civil Executive responsible to Parliament. He dismissed as impracticable the proposal for an Irish Advisory Council, deprecated the making of experiments, and finally announced the appointment of Mr. Duke, K.C., the Unionist Member for Exeter, as Chief Secretary, while indicating that the office of Lord-Lieutenant would for the time being not be filled up.

This announcement gave no satisfaction to the Irish Party. Mr. Redmond declared that the restoration of Dublin Castle with a Unionist Executive would outrage the feelings of Ireland. As the Government were taking full responsibility, it was the plain duty, Mr. Redmond said, of the Irish Party to criticise and oppose the new administration however and whenever they pleased. He appealed to Englishmen not to let their natural indignation at the wicked outbreak of 2,000 men in Dublin lead them to the horrible injustice of forgetting that there were 150,000 Irishmen fighting on the battle-fields of France. These men would never return to Ireland for the purpose of fighting one another. The war had made it certain that there would

never be an Irish civil war. After some further speeches Mr. Bonar Law defended the Unionist Members of the Cabinet, and confessed that it had given him a shock to hear the Prime Minister's statement that nobody would ever be able to take the Home Rule Act off the Statute Book. He affirmed, on the contrary, that, so far as he was able to prevent it, Home Rule would never come into operation until there had been an Amending Bill which carried out fairly the settlement and the views of other sections in Ireland. The debate continued for some time longer, and finally Mr. Dillon's motion was agreed to without a division.

Little further remains to be added on the situation in Ireland, which by this time had generally come to be regarded as a problem that was altogether insoluble. The Irish Nationalist Party met on August 1 and passed Resolutions protesting against the alterations made by the Government in the agreement arranged by Mr. Lloyd George; protesting also against the revival of the discredited system of Dublin Castle Government in Ireland, which had been condemned on all sides, and particularly by the Hardinge Commission, and by the Prime Minister himself; and finally, calling for a full public inquiry into the shootings of persons without trial in the city of Dublin during the recent insurrection. The concluding act in the history of these long and troublesome discussions was the announcement on August 7 that Lord Wimborne had been reappointed Lord-Lieutenant. It was believed that this change of policy had been inaugurated to propitiate Nationalist opinion by the introduction of a Liberal into the Government of Ireland, since the Irish Party did not view with any favour the association of two Unionists, Mr. Duke as Chief Secretary and Mr. J. H. Campbell as Attorney-General, as the leaders of that country.

Meanwhile public attention had once more been drawn to the conditions under which British civilian prisoners were kept in Germany. Early in July the Foreign Office published correspondence respecting the diet and nutrition in the internment camp at Ruhleben. This camp had been inspected by Dr. Taylor of the American Embassy in Berlin on May 12, and he had reported that the interned British subjects were receiving insufficient food to maintain life adequately. This report was afterwards supplemented by a second, dated May 24, in which Dr. Taylor wrote that since his last visit a "sharp reduction has been made in the amount of food-stuffs allotted to the camp," and pointed out how the diet fell below that of the military prisoners in other camps. Sir Edward Grey, on receiving this statement from Mr. Page, expressed the view that if the German Government were not in a position to feed prisoners of war in their hands properly, it was their duty to release them; and in a letter dated June 8 he requested the United States Ambassador at Berlin to obtain permission from the German Government for the British Government to send at fixed intervals a supply of food in bulk sufficient for 500 men,

A further report from Dr. Taylor, however, was received on June 21 recording a 'still further reduction in the food rations at Ruhleben. In two camps Dr. Taylor found that the British prisoners subsisted almost entirely upon supplies received from abroad; but less and less food had been coming in from that source, and many were now living largely on surplus supplies from home, which they had stored. When these were exhausted, Dr. Taylor said, the men would face a critical situation. A notable feature of the diet at Ruhleben was the absence of vegetables and the substitution of saccharine for sugar. In reply to this report Sir Edward Grey demanded from the German Government that the whole of the British civilians at Ruhleben should be released in exchange for a similar number of German civilians interned in this country. He further announced on June 23 that if the German Government did not accept this proposal within a week of their receiving the telegraphic summary of his note, the British Government would be compelled to consider what course they should take with reference to the rations at present supplied to German prisoners in this country.

A discussion on the subject took place in the House of Lords on July 5, in the course of which Lord Devonport suggested that in view of the starvation of our countrymen at Ruhleben we might offer to exchange them with the German civilians interned in this country, although these were ten times more numerous. At a sitting of the House of Commons on July 13 Lord Robert Cecil announced the substance of the German reply to Sir Edward Grey's ultimatum. It appeared that the German Government categorically repudiated the British charge that they did not recognise their obligations as to the supply of food to British prisoners. They had, however, sanctioned the dispatch to the Commandant at Ruhleben of collective consignments of food for those prisoners who received no direct parcels. To this concession, however, the German Government attached the condition that such consignments should not contain a predominance of commodities that were only obtainable to a limited extent by the German people in consequence of the British blockade. With regard to the British threat of reprisals, the German Government proposed, if we fulfilled that threat, not only to withdraw the permission for collective parcels but also to prohibit the receipt of individual parcels. Finally, the German Government declared that they were not averse to the British proposal for the release of all British civilian prisoners, but they declined to make this arrangement on the basis of the release of a similar number of German prisoners by us.

Lord Robert Cecil then informed the House as to the further answer which he had made. The British Government could not accept the proposal to repatriate the 26,000 Germans interned in this country in exchange for the 4,000 British civilians interned in Germany. He repeated the earlier British proposal that all civilians on both sides over 50 should be re-

patriated ; and also all those over 45 who were unfit for service in the field. Lord Robert declined to abandon the policy of reprisals, if that course should appear to be the only way of obtaining justice for our prisoners.

Meanwhile, a discussion on the same subject was taking place in the House of Lords, in the course of which Lord Newton announced that there were about 20,000 German soldiers and sailors in our hands, many of whom were being employed at four camps by the Home Grown Timber Committee. Many German prisoners, he added, had been sent to France to unload ships, and this action had been seized upon by the German Government as an excuse for retaliation.

Notwithstanding these efforts to ameliorate the lot of British prisoners in Germany, a further report from the American Embassy in Berlin stated that practically no improvement had taken place, that the barracks at Ruhleben were overcrowded and that people of education were herded six together in a horse stall and in lofts where their bunks touched one another. Many things, such as soap, usually issued to prisoners even in gaol, were never given to the prisoners at Ruhleben, and notwithstanding the promises of the authorities to improve the housing, no steps in that direction had yet been taken. On July 27 another debate on this subject took place in the House of Lords, when Lord Newton held out some hope of an exchange of civilian prisoners over 45 with Germany. Lord Devonport contended that if we attempted retaliation on German prisoners for the treatment of our men, we should be hopelessly out-distanced and beaten. He regretted that the Government were not inclined to exchange the 26,000 German civilian prisoners in this country for the 4,000 British civilian prisoners in Germany.

The beginning of July witnessed an important change in British naval policy. For a long time past the Government had been urged from various quarters, notably by Mr. Gibson Bowles in the *Candid Quarterly Review*, to repudiate the code known as the Declaration of London. This code, it will be remembered, was drawn up in 1909 by the Powers for the use of an International Prize Court at the Hague. Great objections had been taken at the time to the Declaration, as tending to destroy the maritime power of Great Britain ; and the Naval Prize Bill, which authorised the Declaration and the establishment of an International Court, although passed by the House of Commons, had been thrown out by the House of Lords. At the opening of the war, the Government had adopted the rules of the Declaration subject to certain conditions and modifications. In the course of June, however, conferences had been held with the French authorities in Paris, to consider whether these rules should any longer be maintained, and on June 28 Lord Robert Cecil announced in the House of Commons the decision of the Allied Governments to abandon altogether the

Declaration of London. The announcement was received with widespread satisfaction and was put into force by an Order in Council published in the *London Gazette* on July 8.

The Post Office vote, which was taken by the House of Commons on July 3, elicited some interesting statistics from the Government. Mr. Pease stated that our troops received weekly 7,500,000 letters and 700,000 parcels, weighing 1,500 tons, while the troops sent home 5,000,000 letters a week. 168,000 Zeppelin insurance policies had been taken out for a total of 1,600,000 $\frac{1}{2}$. The additional charges imposed in the autumn of 1915 on letters, parcels, etc., had yielded more revenue than had been estimated, although the 3d. telephone call had not come up to expectations. The total Post Office revenue for 1915-16 showed an increase of 4,000,000 $\frac{1}{2}$ over the previous year, and there was a profit balance of 3,300,000 $\frac{1}{2}$.

The office of Secretary of State for War, which had been vacant since the death of Lord Kitchener, was not permanently filled up until July 6, when it was announced that the appointment had fallen to Mr. Lloyd George, with Lord Derby as Under-Secretary. At the same time Sir Edward Grey went to the House of Lords. Following these appointments other important changes were made in the Cabinet. Mr. E. S. Montagu became Minister of Munitions, Mr. McKinnon Wood became Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Financial Secretary to the Treasury, while Mr. H. J. Tennant took up the office of Secretary for Scotland. At the same time Lord Curzon was invited by the Prime Minister to become a permanent member of the War Committee. On July 12 it was announced that the Earl of Crawford had been appointed President of the Board of Agriculture, while Mr. Neil Primrose succeeded Major Arthur Lee as one of the Parliamentary Secretaries to the Ministry of Munitions.

Notwithstanding the immense sacrifices entailed by the war, the general condition of the country continued to be extraordinarily satisfactory. In a review of the war work of the Local Government Board in the House of Commons on July 11, Mr. Long was able to declare that unemployment was non-existent and pauperism very low. The health of the country was wonderfully maintained. Enteric fever had been steadily decreasing and little anxiety was now caused by cerebro-spinal fever.

At various dates throughout July vigorous criticism was directed against the Government in the House of Commons on account of the conduct of the operations in Mesopotamia. On July 12 Sir Edward Carson asked the Prime Minister if the report on those operations were being purposely kept back. Mr. Asquith insisted that the time was not opportune for a discussion of the subject, but Sir Edward Carson gave warning that if he could not get a satisfactory answer within a few days, he would ask leave to move the adjournment of the House. Next day the question was raised again, and Mr. Bonar Law

announced that a full statement would be made in three days' time on the promised publication of the Dardanelles papers and on the Mesopotamia question. The pressure thus applied to the Government arose mainly from a general belief that for a long period the Mesopotamian forces had not been provided with the necessary stores and equipment; and the gravity of these allegations brought the whole question in the course of July to the forefront of political attention. The debate which was at length forced upon the Government took place on July 18. Great disappointment was then caused by Mr. Asquith's announcement that the Government would not for the present publish the Dardanelles papers, having been advised against that course by the naval, military, and diplomatic authorities. They declined also to publish the Mesopotamian papers on the advice of the Army Council. Mr. Asquith repudiated the suggestion that political considerations had ever been allowed to over-ride military ones. He then dealt with one of the most serious allegations that had been made with regard to the Mesopotamian expedition, namely, that there had been a shortage of medical provision for the sick and wounded. He said that Sir John Nixon had reported after the action of Ctesiphon that in his opinion the medical arrangements had been quite satisfactory. The Government, however, had received unofficial statements which seemed to indicate a very different state of affairs. Inquiries had been made on the spot, and wherever deficiencies had been discovered they had been made good. The same procedure had been adopted with regard to defects of transport, which Mr. Asquith said were being largely remedied and would soon completely disappear. The original expedition of two divisions had been increased to seven, and the urgency of relieving Kut was such that it was thought right to push on the troops in advance of their transport.

These assurances, however, did not satisfy Sir Edward Carson, who told the Prime Minister that thousands of people who had willingly given their sons and relatives to fight our battles thought that the whole matter had been conducted with criminal negligence. The attack of Sir Edward Carson was strengthened by further criticism from Mr. Redmond, who referred to the Dardanelles "scandals," demanded an investigation, and pointed out that there could be no satisfactory discussion in the absence of authentic information.

The critics of the Government by no means intended to let the matter drop; and a motion was framed by Sir Edward Carson formally demanding the appointment of select committees to inquire into the conduct of operations in Mesopotamia and the Dardanelles. But by this time the Government had perceived that they would be unable to resist the pressure of public opinion, and on July 20 Mr. Asquith announced that separate inquiries would be made into the operations in Mesopotamia and at the Dardanelles. He argued against the ap-

pointment of select committees, and stated that two small bodies would be set up consisting of eminent men both in and out of Parliament. A large part of the proceedings would be in secret, and a further condition laid down was that the conduct of these inquiries should not in any way hamper our naval and military operations. The Prime Minister pointed out that the inquiring bodies would have no power to send for persons or papers without an Act of Parliament; but being immediately pressed to introduce a Bill which would confer these powers, he at length gave way and agreed to do so.

Mr. Lloyd George then announced that new arrangements for Mesopotamian supplies had been made within the last few days. While India would remain the main base of the forces, the Commander-in-Chief in India would receive his instructions and be responsible to the Army Council on all matters of *personnel*, administration, and supplies. Further, the War Office would take responsibility for the transport.

The second reading of the Bill, which constituted the Dardanelles and Mesopotamia Commissions, was taken on July 26, when Mr. Asquith suggested that their composition should be as follows:—

Mesopotamia.—Lord George Hamilton (Chairman), Lord Donoughmore, Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P., Sir Archibald Williamson, M.P., and Mr. John Hodge, M.P.

Dardanelles.—Lord Cromer (Chairman), Mr. Andrew Fisher and Sir Thomas Mackenzie (High Commissioners for Australia and New Zealand), Sir Frederick Cawley, M.P., Mr. J. A. Clyde, M.P., and Mr. Stephen Gwynn, M.P.

Many other names were suggested by different members in place of some of those nominated by the Prime Minister, but Mr. Asquith argued against special naval and military representation on the Commissions, and deprecated the complication of the subject by introducing such questions as the escape of the *Goeben* and the *Breslau*. The second reading was then carried.

Several changes, however, were made in the Bill during its Committee stage on July 27. The House accepted the nominations of the Commissioners submitted by the Government, but added nominees of its own, including Mr. Walter Roch, the Liberal M.P. for Pembrokeshire, for the Dardanelles Commission, after a close division. The Government thereupon accepted without demur the proposal that Major Wedgwood, M.P., should be added to the Mesopotamia Commission, and it was further decided that the membership of each Commission should include at least one naval and one military officer chosen from the retired lists. The scope of the inquiries was also extended to include the origin and inception as well as the conduct of the operations in the two theatres of war.

A further addition to the Dardanelles Commission was suggested by Lord Cromer on August 3 in the House of Lords,

when he expressed his intention of moving that a member of that House with a judicial mind should be added. A week later it was announced that Sir William Pickford, one of the Lords Justices, had been selected for this purpose. Referring to the question of publicity, Lord Cromer expressed the hope that there would be no reticence of any kind, and he undertook that nothing should be withheld from the public unless publicity should be detrimental to the public interest. Further information as to the medical arrangements in Mesopotamia was elicited from Mr. Chamberlain on August 14, when he informed the House of Commons that the Vincent Commission appointed to examine this subject had fixed responsibility upon certain officers for the state of affairs disclosed by the investigation. These officers had vacated their positions and new appointments had been made. In reply to a remark of Sir Edward Carson's that very unsatisfactory reports were still coming from Mesopotamia, Mr. Chamberlain confessed that everything had not yet been put to rights, although matters were very much improved.

On July 12 a short Bill was introduced in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister for the purpose of rendering unnecessary the re-election of members of the House on acceptance of certain offices. He explained that as a result of some omissions from the emergency legislation of the previous year, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Montagu, and Sir F. E. Smith had vacated their seats in the House of Commons. The Bill which was thus intended to set right a purely technical difficulty met with no opposition in the House.

From time to time the question still continued to be agitated as to whether it was desirable to hold a General Election during the continuance of the war, and if so, whether it would be practicable to make arrangements for a new register which should include the soldiers and sailors fighting abroad. The Government, apparently feeling some difficulty in reaching a decision on this subject, determined to appoint a select committee, which should inquire into the question whether it was practicable and desirable to prepare a new electoral register, which should include adequate representation of those engaged in the war and in war work, and to conduct an election upon such register during the war. A motion for the appointment of this select committee was moved by Mr. Herbert Samuel in the House of Commons on July 19. Mr. Samuel laid special emphasis on the difficulties of carrying out the task which was to be committed to the proposed new body, and especially on the problem as to how soldiers at the front would be able to vote while they were being submitted to a bombardment. He asked whether there was any justification in embarking upon an expenditure of 300,000*l.* and the labour of 20,000 persons in preparing a register at all, and he expressed his view that the gravest objections were open to such a course, except in case of overwhelming necessity.

Mr. Samuel was somewhat sharply taken to task by Sir Edward Carson for attacking in his speech the very proposal which he was supposed to be advocating. Sir Edward insisted that the country must have a register, since a General Election might be necessary at any moment; but he branded the proposed Committee as a farce and expressed the hope that the House would refuse to set it up and would call upon the Government to do their own business. Many other members took the same view, and at length the Prime Minister, being hastily sent for, consulted with Mr. Samuel and other Ministers and ultimately acquiesced in the obvious feeling of the House that the motion should be withdrawn. He announced that the Government would reconsider the question and make proposals of their own.

The Finance Bill passed its third reading on July 17. The report stage had been set down for consideration on that day, but Mr. McKenna moved that the Bill should be passed without further delay, owing to the approaching exhaustion of his borrowing powers. He informed the House that our expenditure for some time past had been over 6,000,000*l.* a day. His estimate had been 5,000,000*l.* a day, and he attributed the increase to reasons which he could not foretell and over which he had no control. Mr. McKenna was sharply criticised by Sir Edward Carson on account of this large error in his estimate. Sir Edward affirmed that the Government had got into a condition in which they thought they could do anything they liked. A division was accordingly taken before Mr. McKenna's motion was carried.

Although there was no prospect of any early termination of the war, questions concerning the reconstruction which must follow the war were being agitated in the course of the year with increasing frequency. On July 18 Mr. Arthur Henderson announced the steps which were being taken by his department for a general reorganisation of our system of education. Committees were being appointed to investigate three branches of the subject. The first dealt with the problem of the education of young persons after the war with special regard to those who had been abnormally employed. The other two concerned the position of science and modern languages in our system of education. The subject had already been discussed in the House of Lords on July 12, when Lord Haldane had urged the cause of scientific education. Existing methods were however defended by Lord Cromer, who considered that the results as evidenced by our young men were greatly superior to those witnessed in Germany. This debate was resumed on July 19 when Lord Curzon stated the preparations which the University of Oxford was making for the future. It was proposed, he said, that a certain knowledge of science should be necessary for the Arts Degree. The question of research in chemistry was being taken in hand, and a scheme was being worked out for a new degree

in civil science for men intending to go into public life. The debate which was then adjourned for the second time, was resumed a week later. Lord Crewe thereupon announced that the Government intended to set up a committee to review the whole field of national education. It would be composed partly of Members of the Government, and partly of public men of large Parliamentary experience. For the purpose of securing early action the Government had decided to proceed by a committee rather than by a Royal Commission.

The question of trade policy after the war also attracted considerable attention, and Mr. Asquith announced in the middle of July the appointment of a committee to consider this problem with special reference to the conclusions reached at the Paris Economic Conference. The committee was also to inquire what industries were essential for the future safety of the nation and what steps should be taken to maintain or establish them; what steps should be taken to recover home and foreign trade lost during the war and to secure new markets; to what extent and by what means the resources of the Empire could be developed; and how the sources of supply within the Empire could be prevented from falling under foreign control. This committee was under the Chairmanship of Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

The 12th vote of credit during the war and the third of the present year was moved by Mr. Asquith on July 24. The amount asked for was 450,000,000*l.*, the largest sum ever asked for by any Government in our financial history. The size of the vote, indeed, caused some dissatisfaction among back bench members, who tabled a motion asking that votes of credit should be presented for smaller amounts. Referring to this objection, Mr. Asquith explained that the only reason for asking for so large an amount was to tide over the Parliamentary recess and cover the period to the end of October. He denied that any expansion of the daily rate of expenditure was anticipated. That rate he still estimated at 5,000,000*l.* a day, and he referred to the misapprehension which had arisen from Mr. McKenna's statement a week earlier, that the national expenditure had risen to over 6,000,000*l.* a day. What Mr. McKenna was then referring to was the total exchequer issues, including payments for the purchase of American Securities, and not the net daily rate of expenditure which, in fact, had been 4,950,000*l.* since April 1.

In the latter half of July much public attention had been concentrated on the immense increase which had taken place in the sale of cocaine. It was alleged that the pernicious habit of cocaine taking had been introduced into the country with the Canadian Expeditionary Force. Others, however, sought a deeper cause for the evil, and believed that an association existed between the restrictions on the sale of alcohol and the increase in the sale of cocaine. However this might be, it was

clear that the evil was growing to such dimensions as to cause serious alarm; and on July 28 a proclamation was signed by the King in Council prohibiting the importation of this drug except under licence. Various other obstacles were established at the same time to prevent the public from obtaining access to the drug. The very drastic action thus taken was received with general satisfaction. A certain number of prosecutions followed, for the sale of cocaine to unauthorised persons or for its possession by unauthorised persons, but the stocks in possession of the public soon ran out, and thereafter little more was heard of this particular evil.

It will be remembered that when the Whitsuntide Bank holiday was postponed, the workers were promised that they should receive two days when the time of the August Bank holiday arrived. When that time drew near, however, a further postponement was found to be necessary. On July 13 Mr. Asquith appealed to munition workers to postpone all holidays, either general or local, until further notice, for the purpose of enabling the Allied offensive, which had been so brilliantly begun, to be carried through to a triumphant conclusion. He asserted that although an ample supply of munitions was now available, still the consumption was enormous; and from the success achieved the Government was able to gauge the paramount necessity of avoiding even the slightest risk of restriction. The Government, Mr. Asquith said, did not underrate the sacrifices demanded of the munition workers, and he gave them the assurance that all postponed holidays should be given in full, as soon as military exigencies permitted. It had therefore been decided to suspend the August Bank holiday by proclamation. A few days later the Ministry of Munitions and the Admiralty met representatives of workmen and employers for the purpose of securing their co-operation in giving effect to the decision of the Government. At this meeting a letter was read from Sir Douglas Haig pointing out that two days' cessation of work in the munition factories would have the most serious effect on the operations now being carried out by the British Army in France, and urging the British nation to forego any idea of a general holiday until our goal was reached. The proposal of the Government found general agreement among the workers, and a message was sent by the conference to Sir Douglas Haig in which they stated that they had agreed to recommend the postponement of all holidays involving interruption of production until such time as the military exigencies might permit of their being taken. Towards the end of the month a committee was appointed by the Ministry of Munitions, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Arthur Henderson, for the purpose of considering what arrangements could be made for the release of workmen for holidays in relays so as to maintain without interruption an adequate output of munitions. At the same time a poster was circulated throughout the country calling upon the public at large to postpone their holidays.

At the end of July the country was startled by the account of a new atrocity on the part of the Germans. Captain Charles Fryatt, Commander of the steamer *Brussels*, which had been captured by the Germans at the end of July, was tried by court-martial at Bruges, condemned to death, and finally shot on July 28. The reason advanced for passing this sentence upon him was that although he did not belong to the combatant forces he had made an attempt, on the afternoon of March 28, 1916, to ram a German submarine, the U 33, near the Maas Lightship. On that occasion the submarine had escaped destruction only by immediately diving, and the Germans stated that he had confessed that he was acting in accordance with instructions from the Admiralty. Correspondence issued by the British Foreign Office provided evidence that the trial of Captain Fryatt had been hurried in order that no time should be given for intervention on the part of neutrals. All the preliminaries had been carried out with secrecy, and a request made by the American Embassy in Berlin for a postponement of the trial, was refused on the ground that German submarine witnesses could not be further detained.

The murder of Captain Fryatt excited great indignation when the subject was raised in the House of Commons on the last day of July. Mr. Asquith referred to it as an atrocious crime against the law of nations and the usages of war. He repeated the determination of the Government that such crimes should not, if they could help it, go unpunished, and that when the time arrived the criminals should be brought to justice, whoever they might be and whatever their station. On August 16 Sir Edward Carson again raised the subject in the House of Commons, and was informed by the Prime Minister that the Government were of opinion that this country would not tolerate the resumption of diplomatic intercourse with Germany after the war until reparation had been made for the murder of Captain Fryatt and similar outrages. Some of our Allies, he added, had suffered from brutalities even more gross and on a more extended scale than ourselves from the action of the German authorities. The British Government were now in consultation with them as to the most effective steps to be taken, and as to the conditions to be exacted in the terms of peace to secure reparation and satisfy justice. Meanwhile a pension of 100*l.* a year was accorded to Mrs. Fryatt over and above the pension to which she and her children were already entitled under the Government Compensation Scheme. The Great Eastern Railway, moreover, fixed an annuity of 250*l.* a year for life upon Mrs. Fryatt, this sum being equivalent to the salary of Captain Fryatt.

Some encouraging announcements were made in the course of the discussion on the Colonial Office vote on August 3. Mr. Bonar Law was able to declare that German East Africa, a territory with 400 miles of coast-line, and nearly twice the size

of the German Empire, was on the point of coming under the rule of the Allies. There was no part of the Empire, continued Mr. Bonar Law, where the British race was living, that had not taken its part in the war. Wherever it was possible contingents had been sent; where that was not possible, men had come voluntarily to serve in the home regiments. The fact, he thought, that would stand out most prominently in the war was the wonderful part which had been played, not by the United Kingdom alone, but by every portion of the Empire. On August 9 Mr. Lloyd George gave further point to this statement by declaring that he had every confidence that the Australian Government would take all necessary steps to supply drafts to make up the wastage of their contingents in the war area. The splendid services already rendered by Australia encouraged us to hope that every available man would be placed at the disposal of the Empire in order to attain ultimate victory.

The Scottish Estimates were discussed in the House of Commons on the same day, and were notable chiefly for an announcement by Mr. Tennant, the new Secretary for Scotland, that the Duke of Sutherland had presented to the State 12,000 acres of land for the settlement of soldiers and sailors who had been on foreign service, had enlisted voluntarily, and had good records. Of this estate 5,000 or 6,000 acres would be afforested by the State, thus affording employment for the small holders.

An important debate took place in the House of Commons on August 2 on the resolutions of the Paris Conference. Mr. Asquith then announced that these resolutions had been formally and publicly adopted by the British and French Governments. He said that the Government were under an obligation to see that the benefits redounding to industry from the adoption of this new policy were fairly apportioned among all sections of the community. Some action had already been taken to carry out the recommendations. The Board of Trade were devising schemes to render us independent of enemy supplies of dyes, spelter, and other important articles. A scheme of assistance for scientific industrial research had been created. Investigations were being made by experts into the conditions and needs of a number of important branches of industry, and into problems of finance. The question of commercial and industrial policy generally had been referred to a strong Committee, under the Chairmanship of Lord Balfour of Burleigh. The Government were in communication with the Dominions and with India on the subject of the resolutions, and when Lord Balfour's Committee reported, it was proposed to hold a conference in this country with the representatives of the Dominions and India, at which the whole question of the trade policy of the Empire would be considered.

Mr. Asquith laid special stress on the importance of the resolutions which bound the Allies not to grant "most favoured nation" treatment to the enemy powers for a term of years.

The Allies would thus secure freedom to make commercial agreements among themselves or with neutral countries, without being hampered by the obligation to extend any concession to the enemy powers. The Prime Minister insisted that the resolutions were in no way aimed at neutrals, but were framed solely from the point of view of self-defence. With regard to free trade, he urged that it would be pedantry if we were to say that we had forgotten nothing and learned nothing from such a war as this.

The main opponent of the Government policy announced by Mr. Asquith was Sir John Simon, who doubted whether it was true that the Germans were piling up immense stocks to dump on us after the war, or whether it would be an unmixed evil if they did dump large stocks of cheap sugar on the British market. He claimed that it was free trade that was enabling us to beat the enemy, and that the policy of the Government would increase the severity of competition in neutral markets, thus throwing the Central Powers into the arms of the United States. The line of argument followed by Sir John Simon found, however, little sympathy in the House. Mr. Bonar Law, speaking as one of the delegates at the Paris Conference, declared that the one dominant feeling on that occasion was that the resolutions would help the Allies in the struggle in which they were engaged.

From time to time in the course of August the subject of aerial equipment came under discussion. On the first day of the month, Lord Montagu in the House of Lords criticised Sir David Henderson, and was rebuked by Lord Curzon for so doing. On the 10th the subject came up briefly in the House of Commons, and on the 16th was published an interim report by the Committee which, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Justice Bailhache, had been inquiring into the charges made in Parliament against the administration and command of the Royal Flying Corps. The part of the inquiry dealt with in this report concerned only the specific cases in which Mr. Pemberton Billing had alleged criminal negligence on the part of the Flying Corps authorities. The Committee found that in no case had Mr. Billing proved his charges, but on the other hand they expressed the view that he had made other criticisms and suggestions of a more reasonable character with which they hoped to deal fully in a subsequent report. Meanwhile, Mr. Billing himself admitted that "the changes which have taken place in the administration and command of the Royal Flying Corps in the last few months have been, in the words of men in the service, almost miraculous."

Among other subjects of discussion was the question of the social conditions immediately succeeding the war. On August 3 a deputation from the Miners' Federation, the National Union of Railwaymen, and the National Transport Workers' Federation was received by Mr. Asquith in the House of Commons,

and received assurances from him that the restoration of trade union practice after the war was regarded by the Government as an obligation of honour, and indisputably valid. The Government would endeavour to provide special emergency machinery to deal with men and women now employed as substitutes. Demobilisation would be gradual and would involve a scheme of furlough. Towards the end of the month it was announced that two Committees had been appointed to inquire into the position of science and modern languages respectively in the British system of education. The former Committee was under the Chairmanship of Sir J. J. Thomson, and the latter under the Chairmanship of Mr. Stanley Leathes.

The commencement of the third year of the war was celebrated on August 4 by gatherings in all parts of the country, and by universal expressions of the determination of the people to persevere until complete and final victory was attained. At midnight on August 3 the King addressed a message to the Sovereigns and Heads of Allied States, including one to the King of Belgium, in which he renewed his declaration that the Allies would continue the struggle until Belgium had been entirely liberated. On the 4th Mr. Asquith and Mr. Bonar Law addressed an enthusiastic meeting at the Queen's Hall, and a patriotic meeting was held also at the Albert Hall, attended by from 4,000 to 5,000 wounded sailors and soldiers. Services of intercession for victory and of thanksgiving for the measure of success attained were also held in every town and village in the kingdom.

The treatment of British prisoners in the hands of the enemy was brought before the attention of Parliament from time to time in the course of August. On the 7th of the month Lord Robert Cecil made a disquieting statement about the British force captured by the Turks at Kut on June 9. The United States representative at Constantinople had been unable to ascertain the whereabouts of these prisoners, and the United States Consul at Bagdad had not been allowed to get into touch with them. Requests to supply the prisoners' needs had been refused by the Porte, and no reply had been received to protests which had been made through representatives of the United States. On August 10 Lord Robert Cecil announced that the German Government had inquired whether we were prepared to exchange all British and German civilians over 45 years of age, and that we had agreed to do so on certain conditions, the most important of which was, that the remaining British civilians interned in Germany should be exchanged against an equal number of German civilians interned here. It was stated that 4,000 out of the 26,000 German civilians interned here were over 45.

Various changes in the composition of the Cabinet have to be recorded during the month of August. Mr. Arthur Henderson, although nominally President of the Board of Education,

had been devoting a large proportion of his time to the important duty of advising the Coalition on questions relating to labour. His preoccupation with these problems had given rise to some criticism as to the propriety of his remaining at the Board of Education, and on August 9 *The Times* announced his resignation from that Department. He was succeeded by the Marquis of Crewe, K.G.; and Mr. Henderson himself was thereupon appointed Paymaster-General in succession to Lord Newton, who became assistant Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (unpaid). Mr. Henderson thus became free to devote himself to his work as Labour adviser to the Government, his office being established in the new Office of Works buildings, Great George Street, Westminster. He remained, of course, a member of the Cabinet.

On August 8 a debate took place in the House of Commons on the new regulations for supplementary pensions. Mr. Hayes Fisher told the House that the latest offer of the Treasury amounted practically to 7,500,000*l.* for supplementary pensions. He contended that the pensions given by the Statutory Committee were generous beyond comparison with what any country in any war had ever given; and a great feature of the scheme was that it was to be reviewed at the end of two years. The main criticism came from Mr. Hogge, who considered that the State should provide all the money which the House might consider necessary for pensions, and that no part of it should be made up out of charity. Mr. Hayes Fisher, however, said that he could not understand why a man should feel it honourable to live on money forced by taxation from people, but dishonourable to live upon the voluntary offerings of those who were most anxious to help him. How, he asked, could the Statutory Committee send back the thousands of pounds which had been contributed voluntarily? Notwithstanding a further speech by Mr. McKenna, criticism continued to be levelled from various quarters. Mr. Wardle, the acting Chairman of the Labour Party, told the Government that his friends would set their faces against any attempt to exploit pensioners in order to get cheap labour; and many other speakers expressed regret that the Treasury had not shouldered the whole burden. No division, however, was taken upon the question.

The Coalition Government, although it appeared to represent nearly all shades of opinion in the country, had never been really popular with the Unionist Party; and at a special Unionist Conference on August 9, Mr. Bonar Law gave an interesting account of the origin of the Coalition and the reasons which had led Unionist Ministers to join it. The Coalition, he said, had arisen from the discovery of a shortage of munitions and from the resignation of Lord Fisher. He believed that the Unionist opposition could have turned out the Government, but this would have meant an election and consequent hostility in the House of Commons, and it would then

have been impossible to put forward the best efforts of the country to carry on the war. The main reason why the Coalition was disliked by Unionists was that they thought they were still keeping up a Liberal Government by being members of it.

In the course of a debate in Committee of Supply on the Civil Service Estimates on August 10, Mr. McKenna took the opportunity to review the financial position of the country after two years of war. He also submitted a balance-sheet for the end of the financial year on the assumption that the war continued until March 31 next. His estimate worked out as follows :—

Total indebtedness - - - - -	3,440,000,000%.
Advances to Allies and Dominions - - -	800,000,000%.
Net indebtedness - - - - -	2,640,000,000%.
National Income - - - - -	2,500,000,000% or 2,600,000,000%.
Capital Wealth - - - - -	15,000,000,000%.

Mr. McKenna gave other figures also to show how the war had been financed during the first four months of the financial year. They were as follows :—

Treasury Bills increased by - - - - -	275,000,000%.
Exchequer Bonds - - - - -	154,000,000%.
War Expenditure Certificates - - - - -	18,000,000%.
War Savings Certificates - - - - -	13,750,000%.
Paid off - - - - -	46,000,000%.
Received in actual revenue - - - - -	100,000,000%.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer pointed out that we had been financing ourselves almost exclusively out of yearly bills. He was unable to say when he was likely to issue another loan, but he would do so without hesitation whenever the opportunity was favourable.

Turning to the question of our foreign supplies, Mr. McKenna stated that we had to pay day by day sums abroad, which certainly exceeded 1,000,000% and probably came nearer to 2,000,000%. He approved of the action of the Bank of England in raising the bank rate to 6 per cent. The country was in the fortunate position of being able to borrow abroad at a cheaper rate than any of the other belligerent powers. After submitting his estimate of National Income and Indebtedness, Mr. McKenna observed that they would be about equal at the end of March. He calculated that our National Indebtedness would be less than one-sixth of the total National Wealth. They would collect revenue in one year equal to 20 per cent. of the whole debt; further they would be able to pay out of existing taxation the interest on the debt and make provision for a sinking fund, while still retaining a large margin for reduction of taxation. Finally, Mr. McKenna declared that there was every reason to be proud of the manner in which British credit had stood the strain, and that he had not the least doubt that we should be able to maintain our credit to the end of the war, no matter how long that might last.

The approaching adjournment of Parliament made it necessary to consider once more the question as to whether a general election should be held. The position at present was that under the Parliament and Registration Act, 1916 (*v. p. 61*) the life of the present Parliament had been extended to the end of September. On August 14 the Prime Minister introduced into the House of Commons a Bill to amend that Act by extending the life of the present Parliament for a further period of eight months, that is to say, until May 31, 1917. No alteration was proposed in the franchise, but provision was made under another Bill introduced at the same time for a fresh register to be brought into force on the existing basis of qualification from May 31 next. Persons engaged on war work, who were on the existing register but had since lost their qualification, were to be placed on the new register. This provision covered the cases of soldiers and sailors, all persons engaged in work such as mine-sweeping and the laying of cables, ambulance workers, prisoners of war and interned civilians, persons who had been compelled to change their abode, owing to the misfortune of their houses being damaged by hostile bombardment, or to work carried on for home defence, and finally persons who had left their homes in order to engage in munition work elsewhere.

Introducing this Bill, the Prime Minister commented on the anomalies of the existing register which had been drawn up before the war. The war had caused the greatest displacement of population in our history. With reference to the proposal that all soldiers and sailors should be enfranchised Mr. Asquith admitted the attractiveness of the idea, but pointed out the practical difficulties which lay in its way. Was the age limit to remain at twenty-one years? Where and how was the soldier to record his vote? Would there not be the most serious objections to a general election outside the United Kingdom among men actually engaged at the front? If there was a general enfranchisement on the principal of State service, what was the House to do with the women? Mr. Asquith's conclusion was that nothing could be more fatal to the concentration of national effort at a critical stage of the war than that these questions should be thrown into the arena of public discussion in the country. Accordingly the Government did not propose to alter the qualification for the franchise, although they recognised that the peculiar conditions had led to disqualifications which ought to be rectified.

Sir Edward Carson, who followed Mr. Asquith, agreed that the present time was extremely inopportune for a general election, but he saw no necessity for an eight months' extension of Parliament. A register, he said, had always to be ready, for an election without a register would be a farce. He criticised the decision of the Government to take no steps to enfranchise soldiers and sailors, declaring that if a man was good enough to fight, he was also good enough to vote. Mr. Wardle, for the

Labour Party, regretted that there could not be a friendly settlement of the whole franchise question, and the debate then dropped.

On the motion for the second reading of the Special Register Bill, Sir Edward Carson again urged strongly the enfranchisement of soldiers and sailors. He did not agree that it was impossible to devise the requisite machinery. He had been told by officers that there would be no substantial difficulty in the way of the recording of soldiers' votes, which indeed was done by Australia, New Zealand, and Queensland. If the Government would undertake to try to set up machinery of the same kind, he was willing that the Bill should become law as it stood.

Sir John Simon thereupon appealed for recognition of the claims of women to the franchise. He considered that the prevailing atmosphere was not unfavourable to the introduction of wide changes into the franchise. Mr. Asquith freely admitted the defects of the Bill. He started from the assumption that a general election in time of war would be a calamity, but still he thought that some machinery must be provided for the election of a new Parliament. Measures for re-modelling the constitution were out of the question. He announced that the Government would amend the Ballot Act to enable voters in this country, absent from their homes on war service, to record their votes. The Military Authorities, however, were opposed to the extension of that privilege to men at the front. The Government were prepared to accept an amendment limiting the existence of the Special Register to the period of the war and a few months afterwards.

Notwithstanding this defence, the Bill was plainly distasteful to the great majority of the House. Mr. Churchill thought that the difficulties of collecting the votes of a battalion in the field had been greatly exaggerated, and that there would not be the slightest difficulty about the men at sea: an observation which was immediately challenged by Admiral Sir Hedworth Meux. At length the Government were compelled to accept the situation, and Mr. Bonar Law, on behalf of the Prime Minister, abandoned any effort to proceed with the Committee stage before the adjournment.

Thereupon the second reading was taken of the Parliament and Local Elections Bill which provided for the extension of the life of the present Parliament. The Committee stage of this Bill was taken on August 17, when Sir Edward Carson moved that the extension should be for a period of six months only. He thought that Parliament ought not to be extended beyond the shortest convenient period, seeing that the House of Commons represented only about 25 per cent. of the electors. Mr. Asquith suggested a compromise by reducing the period of extension from eight months to seven months, and this was at length agreed to. Under the new Bill, therefore, the life of Parliament was extended to the end of April, 1917.

In the House of Lords the second reading of the Parliament Bill was taken on August 21. Here, once again, were urged the claims of soldiers and sailors to the vote. Lord Parmoor entered a constitutional protest against the extension of the life of Parliament. It appeared to him that a statutory body was being substituted for a representative body. Lord Salisbury expressed the view that voting from the trenches was not nearly so difficult as had been alleged, but Lord Lansdowne again insisted that the great majority of expert military opinion was against this proposal. The Committee stage was considered on the following day. Lord Peel moved to limit the period of prolongation to six months instead of seven. This amendment, however, was opposed by Lord Crewe, and after some further discussion was ultimately dropped. Another amendment, moved by Lord Midleton, was designed to insure that if dissolution of Parliament were to take place before a new register came into force, the new Parliament elected should have a life not exceeding two years. The amendment was opposed by the Government on the ground that they had already given guarantees to that effect; but on this occasion a division was insisted upon, and the amendment was carried against the Government by a majority of five.

A few days before the adjournment for the Summer recess Mr. Montagu, the new Minister of Munitions, gave the House of Commons an interesting account of the work which his Department had accomplished since it came into existence with the Coalition in June, 1915. He said that, as regards shells, the output which in 1914-15 took twelve months to produce could now be attained from home sources in periods varying from three weeks in the case of 18-pounder ammunition to four days in the case of heavy shells. We were now manufacturing and sending to France every week about as much as the whole pre-war stock of land service ammunition in the country. As regards artillery we were turning out in the month nearly twice as many big guns as were in existence for land service when the Ministry started. The monthly output of heavy guns had increased more than sixfold between June, 1915, and June, 1916, while in the same period the weekly output of machine guns had increased fourteen-fold. We should thus very shortly have satisfied all the requirements of the British Army, and should be able to turn our manufacture exclusively to supplying our Allies. The production of high explosives was now sixty-six times as much as it was at the beginning of 1915. Corresponding increases had also taken place in the case of rifles, small arms ammunition, and weapons for trench warfare. Mr. Montagu added that a substantial quantity of finished munitions was also being manufactured for the Allies. One-third of the whole British production of shell steel was being sent to France. Notwithstanding this vast production Mr. Montagu warned the House that against such an enemy as Germany we could never afford to

stand still for an instant. The bombardment which had preceded the recent attack upon the Germans had consumed more light and medium ammunition than the total amount manufactured at home during the first eleven months of the war, while heavy ammunition manufactured during the same period would not have kept the bombardment going more than a day. He attributed much of the success of the Ministry to the labours of Mr. Lloyd George.

The last day of the sitting of the House of Commons before the Summer recess was devoted to the discussion of various subjects of general interest. Mr. Lloyd George gave a general survey of the military situation, and declared that in the two past months we had wrested the initiative from the enemy. He repelled various criticisms which he had heard of our recent offensive. It was not necessary for its justification that we should break through, for it had relieved the pressure at Verdun by causing the enemy to take guns and ammunition from that quarter and concentrate them on our front. It had also prevented the enemy from detaching part of his forces to support the Austrians against General Brusiloff. He warned the House that the enemy was still powerful though this was not true of Germany's Allies; and he declared that there were many valleys to cross and many ridges to storm before we attained final victory. More men, more ammunition, more guns and more equipment were needed. Germany had missed her chance and she knew it. He had no longer any hesitation in stating on the advice of those who were more competent to express an opinion than himself, that this country and the Allies had only to march together steadily and to work together loyally in order to secure that victory would rest on their banners.

Before adjourning, the House of Commons agreed to the amendment inserted by the Lords in the Parliament and Local Elections Bill, limiting to two years the life of a Parliament elected before a new register of voters was brought into force. In the course of a debate on the rise in food prices, Mr. Pretyman justified the attitude of the Government in having refrained from taking any drastic action. The question, he said, was bound up with the general conduct of the war and was secondary in importance to the first object, which must be to win the war. What really governed prices was quantity, and the efforts of the Government ought to be directed to increasing supplies. He assured the House that the Government were doing their best to keep prices down and that they were in daily communication with the public interests concerned. To this statement Mr. Acland added an account of the part played by the Board of Agriculture in maintaining the home production of food. The number of horned cattle in this country was greater now than ever before in our history, and the area of land under grain showed an appreciable increase over the area so cultivated in 1914. At the end of this debate on August 23, both Houses of Parliament adjourned until October 10.

The increase in the price of food had meanwhile given rise to a certain amount of discontent among railway workers, who put it forward as a justification for a demand for a 10s. advance in wages. Towards the end of August a general delegate meeting of the National Union of Railwaymen was held at Essex Hall, followed a few days later by a demonstration in Hyde Park. The feeling among the men appeared to be that, if the State were compelled to find the money for increased wages they would be more ready to take drastic steps to control prices. At the same time a mass meeting of South Wales Railwaymen was held at Cardiff, in which the same demand was formulated. Towards the middle of September the demand began to assume a somewhat more menacing attitude. The South Wales Railwaymen threatened to stop work altogether unless their demand for an advance in wages was conceded within a week. The representatives of the Railway Companies offered an advance of 3s. a week in addition to the 5s. bonus given in October, 1915, and proposed that the question whether anything more should be given should be referred to arbitration. This offer was not accepted by the representatives of the men, and accordingly the Board of Trade intervened on September 15, when Mr. Runciman met the Executive Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen. Later in the day he had an interview with the General Managers of the Railway Companies, and the discussion of the subject was then adjourned for a few days. In view of these developments the representatives of the railway workers assembled at Cardiff decided to postpone their decision to cease work on the night of September 17, in order that further time might be given for arranging a settlement. This course was speedily justified by the event; for on September 20 an agreement was reached on the basis of an increase of the previous war bonus of 5s. to 10s. and of an extra 2s. 6d. to those whose previous bonus was 2s. 6d., that is to say, to the employees under 18. It was estimated that this award would benefit some 350,000 workers, and it was generally felt that the Trade Union Officials had achieved a considerable success. Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., who had been the chief spokesman of the National Union of Railwaymen, expressed the opinion that a very substantial victory had been achieved, adding that the public had no idea how near the country had been to a crisis.

Towards the end of the month there was some agitation about the appointment of Mr. A. G. Holzapfel to the post of British Vice-Consul at Rotterdam. Although Mr. Holzapfel was a British subject, his name was not such as to commend him to the British public generally. A Resolution of the Baltic Exchange expressed dissatisfaction at the appointment, and called upon the British Government to see to it that such appointments in future were conferred only upon persons of wholly British parentage and association. In view of the

agitation carried on, Mr. Holzapfel himself resigned his appointment, and thus terminated a newspaper agitation which, though of small importance in itself, was significant of the sensitiveness of public opinion in this country.

The industrial position after the war excited considerable attention, and in various quarters some anxiety, as time went on. On all sides was felt the necessity for taking measures in advance to prevent industrial strife if possible from following the declaration of peace. The most important discussion which took place on this subject was at the meeting of the Trade Union Congress, which opened at the Birmingham Town Hall on September 4. Six hundred and fifty delegates were present, representing over 2,850,000 Trade Unionists. Mr. Harry Gosling, the Chairman, in opening the meeting referred to the "super-importance" of labour and to the sacrifices which labour had made for the national defence. "Labour," he said, "has been the personification of real patriotism." Referring to the problems of demobilisation and the readjustment of industry after the war, Mr. Gosling expressed the view that unless preparations were made in advance to prevent unemployment after the war, a grave industrial peril would arise. Labour would not submit quietly to any attack on its standard of life. The Government must prevent unemployment by organising extensive public works; "but," he added, "we hope for something better than a mere avoidance of unemployment and strikes. We are tired of war in the industrial field. Would it not be possible for the employers, on the conclusion of peace, to agree to put their businesses on a proper footing by admitting the workmen to some participation, not in profits, but in control in those matters which concern us directly?" The most important suggestions of a definite character made by Mr. Gosling were the creation of a Ministry of Labour and the assumption by the State of control over the transport service and food supplies.

On the second day of the meeting of the Congress, the most important Resolution was one recommended by the Parliamentary Committee of the Congress to accept an invitation from the American Federation of Labour to take part in a National Labour Congress, to be held at the same time and in the same place as the conference of the belligerent nations which would settle the terms of peace. This recommendation was, however, rejected by the delegates by a majority of two to one; not because they thought that labour was not entitled to express its views on the terms of settlement, but because they refused to parley, even when the war was coming to an end, with the Socialists of Germany and her Allies. On September 6 further questions of importance were discussed. One of these turned upon the necessity for the complete restoration, after the war, of Trade Union customs and practices which had been temporarily suspended. Special reference was made in this

connexion to the Munitions Act, the acceptance of which was regarded by labour throughout the country as a grave sacrifice, which, however, they were bound to accept loyally in view of the urgent requirements of the war. Most of the delegates who spoke on this subject openly declared their distrust both of Ministers and of employers, and their belief that in the end Trade Unions would have to exert their own strength to secure the rights which had been guaranteed to them by the Government. Other subjects discussed were the administration of army pensions, the delays in payment, the inadequacy of the amounts allotted and the withholding of pensions on the ground that incapacity arose from illness contracted before service. A demand was made for the reorganisation of industry after the war by the nationalisation of railways, mines, land, and various other forms of capital.

On September 7 the Trade Union Congress returned to the subject of industrial compulsion. A Resolution was passed expressing a grave misgiving with regard to the introduction of compulsory military service into Great Britain. The Resolution affirmed that this country had always been the chief stronghold against tyranny and oppression and against compulsion, industrial and military; and the Parliamentary Committee were instructed to lose no opportunity after the war to press for the repeal of all Acts of Parliament imposing economic, industrial, and military compulsion upon the manhood of the nation, and for the re-establishment of individual liberty with the right, voluntarily, to refrain from organised destruction. On the same day another Resolution was moved by Mr. Ben Tillett, expressing regret that members of the clerical profession were exempted from the operation of the Military Service Act. The Parliamentary Committee were called upon to approach the Government with a view to removing this anomaly whereby a large class of able-bodied men engaged in unproductive employment might be made available to better purposes during so critical a period. This Resolution was carried by a somewhat narrow majority. Another Resolution on the same day was of a more domestic nature. Mr. Smillie brought forward a proposal that the General Federation of Trade Unions should be excluded from representation on the joint Board, which at present consisted of representatives of that Association and also of the Trade Union Congress and of the Labour Party. Mr. G. Roberts, M.P., expressed his view that the expulsion of the Federation would split the labour movement for a generation. Nevertheless, the Resolution was carried by a majority of three to two. The only remaining subject discussed, which need be mentioned, was the fiscal policy to be pursued by this country after the war. The Congress adopted a line which, though not very definitely expressed, certainly seemed to suggest that they in no way desired to be committed to a policy of rigorous free trade. A Resolution was adopted, indeed, calling for the re-

striction or prevention of the importation of cheap manufactured goods produced abroad under worse labour conditions than those at home. Reviewing the work of the Congress as a whole, it may be observed that no strong line of policy was decided upon in any sphere. Vagueness and indetermination seemed to characterise the Resolutions which were passed. It appeared as though the war had unsettled much of the former pronounced convictions of the labour movement, and that no new convictions of corresponding strength had yet been evolved. The ideals of labour were undergoing a change. The atmosphere of war was highly unfavourable to the realisation of their doctrines, and it was hard to prophesy what new beliefs and new spirit would ensue from the comparatively vacillating and weakened position of the movement.

During the first half of September considerable public annoyance was caused by the action of the Army Authorities in what was called "rounding up" of men of military age, who for some illegitimate reason had escaped the operation of the Military Service Acts. All over the country—at theatres, railway stations, football fields, public parks, and other places where the public were gathered together—bands of soldiers and police would appear closing up the exits and stopping everyone who appeared to be of military age, and demanding documentary evidence of their exemption. If no such evidence were forthcoming, the man was taken to the nearest police station for investigation to be made. The cause of this action was a belief, or a suspicion, that a certain proportion of men had failed to register under the Registration Act of the previous year. This revival of the Press Gang, however, quickly disclosed the small basis of fact that existed for such a suspicion. The number of men actually obtained in this manner was exceedingly small and altogether out of proportion to the inconvenience to which the public were put. A clamour was raised against what was considered to be an illegitimate extension of militarism and interference with individual liberty, and after a few days the Military Authorities, in deference to the clamour, and to the small results accruing from these unpleasant raids, abandoned their policy, at all events on a wholesale scale, although from time to time afterwards up to the end of the year minor raids were carried out in various parts of the country.

This policy was at all events a symptom of the fact that the question of men for the Army would again soon come before the public attention. The great majority of the men furnished to the Army by the two Military Service Acts had now been secured, and it was clear that either the Army would have to put up with a reduced intake of recruits or else that a new source of supply would have to be tapped. The question of raising the age limit to 45 began to be considered. The extension of Compulsory Service to Ireland was advocated in many quarters. Finally a gradually increasing demand grew

up for the "combing out" of men of military age who were engaged in civil occupations under the Government or in reserved trades. At length it was announced in *The Times* on September 21 that a "Man-Power Distribution Board" had been appointed under the Chairmanship of Mr. Chamberlain, the other members being Lord Midleton (Vice-Chairman), Mr. Arthur Balfour, J.P., of Sheffield, the Rt. Hon. G. N. Barnes, M.P., and Mr. Stephen Walsh, M.P. The duty of the Board was "to determine all questions arising between Government Departments relating to the allocation or economical utilisation of man-power for the purpose of the successful prosecution of the war, and, in order to give effect to its determination, to direct the Government Departments concerned to create the machinery necessary to co-ordinate their activities in regard to the distribution or utilisation of men and women."

After taking evidence from the Board of Admiralty, the Army Council, the Ministry of Munitions, and other Government Departments, the "Man-Power Distribution Board" announced in the beginning of October their first measures in the direction of "combing out." In their memorandum they said that it had been proved that fresh supplies of men were urgently needed for the Army and munition factories in order to maintain our forces in the field at the numbers already fixed for them, and at the same time to maintain the supply of munitions essential for their equipment and proper utilisation. The first decisions of the Board were to declare certain classes of men ineligible for exemption badges. Highly skilled men of certain trades might be claimed by the Ministry of Munitions; dilution of labour must be extended, and applications and appeals for exemption must be expedited and closely scrutinised. These instructions of the Board were fortified by a speech delivered on October 4 by General Sir William Robertson at Dalderby in Lincolnshire, in which he spoke with confidence of our steady progress to victory but earnestly appealed for the release of more men, and for the utmost national effort by men and women of every age. On October 5 it was further announced in a notice to farmers from the President of the Board of Agriculture that before the new year a census would be taken of men of military age still engaged in farming.

In addition to the programme for combing out, the possibility of applying conscription to Ireland was continually discussed, though without much hope that any real step could be taken in this direction. On October 6, Mr. Redmond, speaking at Waterford, said that "he could not believe the Government would be insane enough to challenge a conflict with Ireland in the matter of conscription. Conscription would be the most fatal thing that could happen in Ireland." On October 8, the Lord-Lieutenant declared that opinion in Ireland upon the subject was divided. There were some Unionists, he said, and not a few Nationalists who thought that compulsion would be

the making of Ireland. He adhered, however, to the principle that national service in any community was not practicable without a measure of general consent, and there was no good ground for asserting that such a measure of general consent existed at present in Ireland. The Irish Unionist Members of the House of Commons, however, meeting on October 11 under the Chairmanship of Sir Edward Carson, passed a Resolution placing on record their opinion that the Government should extend the Military Service Act to Ireland. This group in the House of Commons further expressed its readiness to assist the Government in whatever measures might be thought necessary for increasing the strength of the Army in the field. The maintenance of recruiting for the Army was at the same time anxiously discussed by the two War Committees of the Liberal and Unionist parties. Soon afterwards the discussion passed once again into the arena of the House of Commons itself. The debates which took place will be referred to shortly.

It is perhaps natural that the line of action taken by the United States in their diplomatic intercourse with Germany was not widely appreciated in this country. Occasional hints were heard of a possible American intervention towards the conclusion of peace. All such hints, however, were somewhat warmly resented by the great majority of the British people, and this sentiment received definite expression in an interview which Mr. Lloyd George accorded to an American journalist and which was published in the newspapers, both of England and of America. In the course of this interview Mr. Lloyd George declared that Britain had only begun to fight. The British Empire had invested thousands of its best lives to purchase future immunity for civilisation, and this investment was too great to be thrown away. The British soldier, he said, was a good sportsman. He enlisted in this war in a sporting spirit, he went in to see fair play to a small nation trampled upon by a bully, and having made all these sacrifices the war could not be ended except by a complete victory. "The fight must be to a finish—to a knock-out." This declaration of the War Minister excited much attention among the neutral countries to whom it was addressed; and had the effect, at all events, of making quite clear the futility of any attempt on their part to terminate the war until the victory of the Allies had been established.

We have already referred to the establishment in June (*v. p.* 15) of a Board of Trade Committee on food prices, under the Chairmanship of Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P. The first recommendations of this Committee for mitigating the rise in prices of meat, milk, and bacon were made in an interim report issued on September 29. The most important decisions unanimously arrived at were the speeding up of mercantile shipbuilding, the extension of the restrictions on the importation of superfluities, the development of the Government meat purchase policy, the imposition of

conditions on merchants and retailers of Government-bought meat to secure sale at reasonable prices, the empowering of local authorities to open municipal shops for the sale of milk, meat, bacon, and other food-stuffs, where retailers were taking excessive profits, the revision by employers and public bodies of their pay-rules in favour of the lower paid workers. Finally, the Committee unanimously suggested that the public should voluntarily refrain from the consumption of meat for one day in every week. In a supplementary memorandum signed by seven of the twelve members of the Committee, more far-reaching Government action was recommended, including the establishment of a State Monopoly of meat-buying from abroad where possible, and the fixing of prices for home-produced meat, bacon, and milk.

CHAPTER IV.

THE RECONSTRUCTION.

PARLIAMENT reassembled after the Summer recess on October 10, when an important statement was made in the House of Commons by Mr. Runciman on the control of wheat supplies. He affirmed that this could not be left during the coming year to private enterprise. The Government had endorsed the conclusion of the Cabinet Committee on food supplies to the effect that they must now provide for a further development of importation by the State. A Royal Commission had been appointed under the Chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crawford to give effect to this decision of the Government. It would be the duty of this Royal Commission to undertake the control of the importation of wheat into the United Kingdom, and the experience of the Sugar Commission would be available for its guidance. Mr. Runciman further announced that a very large purchase of Australian wheat had been made, and that steps had been taken to provide all the tonnage required for the conveyance of wheat bought by the Government.

The more general question of food prices was debated, though somewhat inconclusively, on October 17, when Mr. Barnes, from the Labour benches, brought forward arguments in favour of stronger Government action. He contended that, speaking generally, the Government had moved so haltingly that most of the opposing interests had been given time to neutralise largely the benefits which would have accrued to the public. Among his concrete suggestions were the fixing of the price of bread, and the maintenance of the supply of milk at a reasonable price. Finally he advocated the conclusion that a Food Minister should be appointed. Further speeches were made by Captain Charles Bathurst and Mr. George Lambert before a second Labour speaker, Mr. Anderson, expressed his view that unless the Government did something, not merely to

steady food prices, but to bring them down, they would have to face very considerable wage movements in the coming winter.

The reply of the Government to these arguments was made by Mr. Runciman, who put forward the general proposition that the true explanation of a great deal of the rise in prices was that the consuming capacity of the people had gone up, while the sources of supply had been curtailed. He declined to accept any of the remedies suggested by his critics and set aside the idea of the appointment of a Minister of Food. With regard to meat, he pointed out that the Government had spent altogether over 60,000,000*l.* in the purchase of meat, and declared that the meat control so far as it had gone had been effective.

Mr. Runciman then turned to the shipping operations of the Government. He explained that the bulk of the mercantile marine was under control, and that all except a small part of the controlled shipping was running at blue-book rates, that the remainder was running at fixed rates which bore no relation to the open market rate, and that only a small fraction was running at free rates. He argued that the real thing from which we were suffering now in shipping was a deficiency. We were doing our best to put vessels into the water as quickly as we could, but he reminded the House that we had actually lost by enemy action and by marine risks two million gross tons of shipping since the war began, or more than the whole mercantile marine of France, or Spain, or Italy. That loss represented nearly three million tons dead weight. Finally, Mr. Runciman dismissed the idea of instituting bread tickets, meat coupons, or other artificial arrangements, which were, he said, harmful to those who had the least with which to buy. He wished to avoid any rationing of the people in the future.

We have now to record the further progress of the discussions on the available man-power of the country. The subject reached the House of Commons on October 12, when Mr. Lloyd George insisted that there was no doubt of the existence of large sources of available man-power in this country. He defended the Military Service Acts on the ground that they had already produced a very considerable number of men, and would continue to do so through the lapsing of the many temporary exemptions which had been granted. Without those Acts the forces of the country would have been insufficient to enable the Government to carry on the war. The War Minister expressed the opinion, however, that the exemptions had been far too numerous; whereas in France and Italy the exemptions ran to hundreds of thousands, in this country they ran to millions. The Government were dealing with this question, and hoped that it would not be necessary to have any legislation, as they believed that they had sufficient powers in the two Acts already passed. He asserted once more that the one determination of the Government was that all the resources available in this country of wealth and man-power should be utilised to the

utmost for the purpose of winning the war. At present we had got the men, but he warned the House that the Government had to look forward to the possibilities of a long campaign. In the course of this debate, Sir Edward Carson expressed his dissatisfaction with the contribution made by Ireland to the Army. He could not agree with the Lord-Lieutenant who had affirmed that the enlistment of 17 per cent. of the male population of military age was a splendid contribution.

A minor point in the problem of man-power was again discussed in the House of Commons on October 24, when Mr. George Terrell obtained permission to move the adjournment of the House to call attention to the action of the Army Council in calling up for service men who had voluntarily attested and who had before June 24 (the appointed day under the second Military Service Act) attained the age of 41 years. Mr. Lloyd George thereupon announced that the Government had decided to call up for service those men of 41 on whom they had a legal claim, and promised at the same time that attested men should not be placed in a worse condition than the unattested. If the Government did not secure the eligible men of 41 they would lose the equivalent of at least two Army Corps. Passing to the more general question, Mr. Lloyd George stated that the Government did not think it would be necessary to raise the age-limit, nor did he believe that Parliament would act on the thoroughly irrational interpretation of a pledge, which would involve the bringing in of another Act.

The fourth vote of credit presented to the House of Commons for the service of the financial year 1916-17 was moved by Mr. Asquith on October 11. The amount proposed was 300,000,000*l.*, and was calculated to last to Christmas. Mr. Asquith stated that our daily expenditure was now a little over 5,000,000*l.* Expenditure on the Navy had been stationary; on the Army there had been a slight reduction; on Munitions there had been, as expected, a substantial increase. But the most important part of the Prime Minister's speech was his repudiation of the possibility of any peace not founded on the complete victory of the Allies. No one, he declared, desired to prolong for a single day the tragic spectacle of bloodshed and destruction, but we owed it to those who had given their lives for us that their supreme sacrifices should not have been made in vain. The aims of the Allies were not selfish or vindictive; they required that there should be adequate reparation for the past and adequate security for the future, and on their achievements we in this country honestly believed depended the best hopes of mankind.

This declaration on the part of the Prime Minister was welcomed by Mr. Wardle on behalf of the Labour Party, after which Mr. Holt attacked Mr. Lloyd George for his recent interview with an American journalist (*v. p.* 171). Defending his statements on that occasion, Mr. Lloyd George replied that inter-

vention of neutral countries at the present moment would be a military triumph for Germany and a military disaster for us. He refused to withdraw a single syllable of the interview, which was not merely the expression of his own opinion, but of that of the Cabinet, the War Committee, and their military advisers. In the course of this speech, it was abundantly clear that the feelings of the House strongly supported the words of Mr. Lloyd George.

In the middle of October the state of Ireland was once more brought before the public attention. The Royal Commission, presided over by Sir John Simon, which had been appointed on August 17 to inquire into the circumstances connected with the shooting of Mr. Sheehy Skeffington during the Irish rebellion, issued its report on October 16. The facts to be investigated by the Royal Commission concerned the imprisonment and shooting of Mr. Skeffington in Portobello Barracks without any court-martial or form of trial. Captain Bowen-Colthurst who had ordered Mr. Skeffington to be shot had already been tried by court-martial and adjudicated to have been out of his right mind at the time. The findings of the Royal Commission established the facts that Mr. Skeffington had no connexion with the rebellion, that his views were opposed to the use of physical force, and, indeed, that he had been engaged that very afternoon in making some public appeal to prevent looting and the like. The Commission pointed out that a proclamation of Martial Law did not confer upon an officer any right to take human life in circumstances where this would have been unjustifiable without such a proclamation. Further the Commission found that Captain Bowen-Colthurst was not effectively reprimanded at the time, and that the other civilians detained were not rendered more secure. With the issue of the report of the Royal Commission this unfortunate incident closed. There is little doubt that it had created a very disagreeable impression throughout Ireland.

The dissatisfaction of the Nationalist Party with the existing system of government in Ireland was expressed in a Resolution moved by Mr. Redmond in the House of Commons on October 18, and amounting virtually to a vote of censure on the Government. It charged Ministers with maintaining a system of government in Ireland inconsistent with the principles for which the Allies were fighting in Europe. Mr. Redmond, in the course of his speech, enumerated various grievances from which the Irish were suffering. He complained that from the first the efforts of those who, like himself, wished well for the Allied cause, were thwarted, ignored, and snubbed by the British Government. The saddest thing in the present situation, he said, was the danger that the Irish Regiments at the front could not be kept up to their full strength. He declared that he would do anything possible to avert that catastrophe, but it was no use asking him to do the impossible. He would

not listen to any proposals for conscription. His first demand was that the Government should withdraw Martial Law. The forces in Ireland should be placed under the command of some man who had not been connected with the unhappy transactions of the past. The Defence of the Realm Act should be administered in the same spirit as in Great Britain. Mr. Redmond asked further for the release of the 500 prisoners who had not been tried, and that those prisoners who had been sentenced to penal servitude should be treated as political prisoners. Finally, he urged the Government to trust the Irish people once and for all by putting the Home Rule Act into operation.

Various speakers replied on behalf of the Government. Mr. Duke asked whether Ireland ought to stand aside when Britain was fighting a war of existence. The obstacle to Home Rule in Ireland was the absence of agreement among Irishmen. That difficulty could only be overcome if Irishmen were to present an agreed scheme to the House of Commons. He was satisfied that there were men still free in Ireland who were prepared to repeat the proceedings of Easter week. Under the present system no such repetition was possible, and in the meantime it was the paramount duty of the Government to secure to every law-abiding Irish subject adequate protection.

Later in the debate Mr. Asquith himself intervened. After repudiating suggestions that the *personnel* of Dublin Castle was opposed to Home Rule in spirit, he paid a tribute to the past efforts of Mr. Redmond to promote recruiting in Ireland. The present situation, he urged, was provisional, and he hoped transitory. Martial Law, although it existed in name, was not a substantial reality. It was true that Trial by Jury in certain cases was suspended, but this was done under the Defence of the Realm Act, and it was now being considered whether an equal safeguard against a recrudescence of past troubles could be secured in any other way. The Prime Minister made it clear that he still held the view that the existing system of Irish administration had broken down, and that the bad atmosphere which now prevailed could be dispersed only by an agreed settlement. He expressed the belief that there was no party and no sane politician in Great Britain who would not welcome such an agreement, and co-operate in giving it complete and lasting effect.

The most vigorous criticism of the Government, however, came from Mr. Devlin, who ridiculed the conduct of Ministers in talking on the one hand of fighting for the liberties of small nations and seeking on the other hand to justify Martial Law in their own small nation. He accused the Government of "selling" the Irish soldiers, and commented on the sentiments entertained by the men in the trenches, when they reflected that they were fighting for the rule of Sir John Maxwell. He affirmed that all the eloquence of his colleagues would not now

bring recruits from Ireland; unless the Government gave the Nationalists something more than speeches, they could not expect any support or co-operation from them. Finally, he declared that they could have all they wanted if they gave Ireland Home Rule.

The problem of recruiting in Ireland was again referred to by Mr. Lloyd George later in the evening. He contended that the principle that nationality should be respected in the disposition of men and units had not of late been departed from, except in emergency. As regards the general position of recruiting in Ireland, he admitted that irreparable mistakes had been made in the early days, which had to some extent chilled the first enthusiasm. Since the beginning of the war only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the Irish population had been accepted for service,—a very low proportion compared with the contributions of other parts of the United Kingdom and of the Dominions. He appealed to men of all parties to put aside prejudices and aid in improving the Irish atmosphere. He declared that we could not do without Irish help. "Let us make it easy for Ireland to assist." Mr. Redmond's motion was then rejected by 303 votes to 106, a Government majority of 197; the minority was made up of 59 Nationalists and 47 Liberal and Labour Members.

In the course of October various speeches of importance were made on the progress of the war. At a dinner given to the Duke of Devonshire on October 18 as Governor-General designate of Canada, Sir William Robertson referred to the fact that practically all the prophets before the war had been wrong with regard to the attitude and assistance of the Over-seas Dominions. As to the general military situation, he thought that the country and the Empire ought to be more than satisfied with what they had achieved, considering the way in which they had started. The end, he said, was not yet in sight. It had taken us two years to begin; we had at length got through the beginning stage, and were now at what he called the middle stage. He did not think the question should be asked as to when the end would come. What we had to do was to concentrate upon the middle stage; the end would come when the enemy was beaten, and the enemy could be beaten only by hard fighting. If we stuck firm to our resolution to carry the war right through, he thought that we might, with God's help, look forward to victory crowning our efforts and to our being able to wrest such a peace from the enemy as we had said we meant to have.

Shortly after this, the origins of the war were once again discussed by Viscount Grey in the course of a luncheon at which he was entertained by the Foreign Press Association in London. After endorsing the recent pronouncements of Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Grey declared with emphasis that because the war was not forced on Germany as she had alleged, but was forced by Germany on Europe, it was the Allies who must have guarantees of future peace. He said that the separation

of one of the Allies from the others would not mean the safety of that nation but its destruction. For all of them unity was essential, not merely to victory, but to their future life and success. Germany was repeatedly trying to separate them; but not a week passed without confirming their joint resolve to go through with each other to the end. The best work at present open to neutrals was to develop public opinion in favour of such an agreement among nations as would prevent this kind of war from ever occurring again, but he insisted that no nations which combined together to preserve peace should undertake more than they were prepared, if necessary, to uphold by force when the time of crisis came.

The Foreign Secretary went on to declare that there must be some agreement after the war as to the methods of conducting war. Germany had been the great anarchist who had thrown down all the barriers which civilisation previously built up to keep the horrors of war within bounds. For years before the war we had been living under the deepening shadow of Prussian Militarism. There must be no end to this war—no peace except a peace which would ensure that Europe should henceforth live free from that shadow.

Another important speech was made by the Prime Minister on October 25 at a National Conference of representatives of the coal mining industry. Mr. Herbert Samuel, who was in the chair, stated that the output was 15,000,000 tons a year below the amount which was essential for home needs and export, and that if the 5 per cent. of avoidable absenteeism were corrected, the 15,000,000 tons would be secured. The duty of the miner, he said, was to get coal, and more coal and yet more coal, remembering that every stroke of the pick was a blow at the enemy. He asked whether a man who deliberately and persistently did less work than he could and ought to do should remain exempt from military service. As regards Mr. Asquith's speech, the main point was his insistence upon the fact that since 1913, owing to the enlistment of miners, our coal output had fallen from 287,000,000 tons to 253,000,000 tons, and that the demand was now in excess of the supply. In the present struggle, he said, coal for munition making, for motive power, and for export was secondary in importance only to men. The export had fallen since 1913 from 73,500,000 tons to 43,500,000 tons, a dangerously low figure. The most practicable and urgent remedy was a reduction of the time lost by avoidable absenteeism, which now amounted to 5 per cent. The avoidance of that loss would make good the deficiency in the output. How to avoid it was a practicable problem which the miners and owners must solve. After these speeches Mr. Smillie, President of the Miners' Federation, and Mr. Nimmo, President of the Mining Association, moved and seconded a Resolution which was unanimously carried, pledging the meeting to do everything in its power by co-operation between employers and work-

men to secure regularity of work and prevent avoidable absenteeism.

Towards the end of October, Lord Newton announced in the House of Lords that an agreement had been made with the German Government for an exchange of all British civilian prisoners over 45 years of age in Germany against all the German civilians in the British Empire, who were also over 45 years of age. The British Government had stipulated that not more than twenty men on each side should be retained for military reasons, and that no one should be obliged to leave who did not wish to. Lord Newton pointed out that this was an enormous numerical concession on our part, as while we should get back between 600 and 700 the Germans might get 7,000; but he reminded the House in justification of the Government that the Germans interned here represented the most active and undesirable part of the German garrison that had quartered itself upon us before the war. On the very next day *The Times* published a summary of the White paper issued by the Government Committee on the treatment by the enemy of British prisoners of war, and dealing with the typhus epidemic at the prisoners' camp at Gardelegen. This camp, which was situated half-way between Hanover and Berlin, had been swept in 1915 by a typhus epidemic, lasting from February to June. The camp contained about 11,000 prisoners, of whom 260 were British. The over-crowding was appalling, the food was very insufficient, the scale of diet was "not sufficient to keep an adult in a normal state of nutrition." The German under-officers had established a "reign of terror" among the prisoners, and bullying was continuous. When the epidemic was discovered all the Germans bolted, including the guards. Three officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps were brought to the camp, together with seven Russian and French military doctors, who were practically left to shift for themselves. There were hardly any drugs or dressings, no invalid food, and for a long time no bedsteads. Of twenty-two British soldiers who worked as hospital attendants, only two escaped the infection. Of the sixteen doctors who worked in the camp at various times, only four were not struck down. Two of the doctors and two of the soldiers died. The effect of the publication of this report was the same as had followed previous reports of German atrocities. The determination of the people was fortified to prosecute the war at any cost to a successful conclusion, and to exact reparation for the outrages which had been committed upon their countrymen.

On October 24 the Home Secretary issued a new Order under the Defence of the Realm Regulations providing for the early closing of shops during the winter. The Order was to take effect from October 30, and continue in operation until April 30, 1917, the hour of closing being fixed at 7 o'clock on ordinary days, 8 o'clock on Fridays, and 9 o'clock on Saturdays. A few

necessary exceptions were allowed to this Order, but, apart from these, anyone infringing the Home Secretary's instructions became liable to penalties under the Defence of the Realm Act.

In consequence of criticism directed against the Order, it was amended a few days later by the permission to shops to remain open until 8 o'clock on the first five days of the week and until 9 o'clock on Saturdays. This concession was announced by Mr. Herbert Samuel in the House of Commons on October 26; and was followed by a debate on the drink restrictions, which resulted in the majority of the Government falling to twelve votes. Colonel Gretton introduced the debate by moving a resolution declaring that the Central Control Board should no longer be independent of the control of Parliament. He charged the Board with exceeding the functions entrusted to it by Parliament, and contended that it had become tyrannical to the public and oppressive to the licensed trade.

Mr. Montagu, speaking for the Ministry of Munitions, made it plain that the Board had the confidence of the Government. He quoted figures which showed a heavy reduction in convictions for drunkenness since the Board had got to work, and explained that it was his Ministry and not the Board which was responsible for orders scheduling new areas. Mr. Leif Jones set up a plea for total prohibition, and Major Astor, one of the members of the Board, then justified the restrictions which had been established as being war measures primarily intended to secure the maximum of industrial efficiency. In the subsequent voting the figures were 97 to 85 in favour of the Government. In point of fact, statistics of convictions for drunkenness for the last ten years showed a slight but regular falling from 1906 to 1909, followed by a more pronounced rise until 1913, when the number exceeded a hundred thousand. Convictions in 1914 were somewhat fewer, and since the establishment of the Central Control Board had fallen immensely, being less than 33,000 for the first three-quarters of 1916, that is to say, much less than half that recorded in 1914.

At the beginning of November the chief subjects of political discussion were the work of the Air Board and the perpetual problem of man power. On the last day of October Mr. Balfour met a deputation of members of the Parliamentary Air Committee at the House of Commons and discussed with them various aspects of the Royal Naval Air Service. The chief suggestion made to him was formulated by Mr. Ashley, and was to the effect that an Air Lord should be added to the Board of Admiralty. It was also urged that the Air Service should receive a larger recognition and be more closely associated with the Ministry of Munitions. Mr. Balfour, however, was unable to give much encouragement to the members of the Air Committee; and Mr. Ashley afterwards publicly expressed his view that the attitude taken up by the First Lord of the Admiralty was unsatisfactory and did not tend to realise the measure of

co-operation and centralised control which the exigencies of the war had shown to be necessary. Criticism continued to be directed against the Admiralty throughout the course of November. It gained additional strength on account of the success of the new German submarine campaign, and finally culminated at the end of the month in the important changes in the Admiralty which will be described later.

The problem of man power seemed destined to continue in an urgent form as long as the war lasted. The raising of the military age and the extension of conscription to Ireland were so unpopular or impracticable for the time being that the whole energy of the Government was turned to finding the recruits which they needed among those who had been hitherto exempted from military service. At length a scheme of substitution was devised according to which men who had been passed as fit for lower grades of service in the field were to be called up and substituted for men who were engaged in agriculture or essential industries, but who were none the less fit for general service. At the same time the younger civil servants in the Government offices were subjected to a renewed combing out. On November 9 the main report of the Man Power Distribution Board was sent to the Government. Its recommendations, however, did not begin to be put in practice till the following month, and throughout the course of November the intake of recruits was derived from the sources already mentioned.

At the end of October the House of Commons gave some attention to the Registration of Business Names Bill, the object of which was to ensure that persons who traded should disclose who they were. Although the Bill was not in reality a war measure, its consideration was controlled almost entirely by war matters. Sir Edward Carson took the opportunity to speak strongly in favour of the complete elimination of enemy influence in this country. He charged the Government with having done almost nothing in this direction and indeed with having thwarted the efforts of others. He thought that the whole mischief would be found to arise from the small attention which we had given to our naturalisation law; he held that the present Bill was quite insufficient to do what the public wanted to have done, and called upon the Government to realise that the sooner they produced a Bill dealing with the problem of enemy influence as a whole the better it would be for the country. This discussion, although not productive of any immediate undertaking by the Government, nevertheless had some effect in the desired direction, for steps were shortly afterwards taken for the total exclusion of all enemy influence from the trade of the country.

Meanwhile, arrangements had been made for a sale to take place on November 14 of enemy properties in Nigeria, and the Colonial Office had decided to allow subjects of neutral powers who were not acting on behalf of enemy interests to bid. This decision was far from acceptable to the Enemy Influence Com-

mittee which had now been formed by Sir Edward Carson; and on November 8 a debate was brought on in the House of Commons by a joint resolution declaring that such properties should be sold only to natural-born British subjects or to Companies wholly British.

The resolution was moved by Mr. Leslie Scott, who asked why valuable businesses should be allowed to pass into alien hands. It was admitted that a combine existed in Nigeria, but he thought that British statesmanship should be able to control a ring of British merchants without inviting America and Holland to go in and buy. The resolution was plainly popular in the House, and Mr. Steel Maitland who replied for the Colonial Office was repeatedly interrupted. He dwelt especially on the close understanding existing between the big British firms in Nigeria and on the decline in the price paid to the native producer. He defended the action of the Colonial Office on the ground that it was intended to do justice to the natives as well as to British trade. They were suffering from the existence of this combine and were receiving far less than the natives on the Gold Coast and in Sierra Leone where no such combine existed.

The main attack upon the Government, however, came from Sir Edward Carson who asked whether the Government meant to allow the fruits of the war to be applied to the benefit of the British or whether others were to share them. He charged Ministers once more with ignoring the state of tension in the country as regards enemy influence and enemy interference. He suggested that the properties in question might be treated as Crown lands or dealt with on the French system of control by short leases; and he affirmed that the treatment of this question by the Government was not in keeping with the spirit of the Paris Resolutions.

Mr. Bonar Law in winding up the debate on behalf of the Government took the line that the resolution was a vote of censure. He condemned the proposal to exclude our Allies from the sale as utterly indefensible, saying that a French company meant to bid for some of the properties. If the resolution were passed it would be interpreted as the initiation of a new policy for the British Empire. The Unionist policy had been a system of preference, but this was a system of prohibition. At length the motion was rejected by 231 votes to 117, the minority consisting of about 60 Unionists, 44 Nationalists, and a few Liberals.

The Committee stage of the Special Register Bill came up for consideration in the House of Commons on November 1. The main controversial question connected with this Bill was that of giving the vote to soldiers on active service. It had been hoped to decide this question on an instruction before going into Committee on the Bill, but as soon as the question came up the Speaker ruled that an instruction to this effect would be out of order. When Mr. Long had spoken, Sir Edward Carson de-

clared that after the Speaker's ruling the Bill had little interest for anyone in the House. He could not understand why the House should go on with the Bill if nothing was to be done for the soldiers and sailors fighting at the front. From no quarter were the Government urged to proceed with the Bill. A few members, however, called for an adjournment of the debate until the question of soldiers' votes had been settled one way or the other. A hurried consultation took place between the Prime Minister, Mr. Bonar Law, and Mr. Long, at the end of which Mr. Asquith asked the House to continue with the Committee stage of the Register Bill, undertaking to give an opportunity for securing decision on the question which had been raised by Sir Edward Carson. The feeling of the House against this procedure was so obvious, however, that the Prime Minister eventually had to give way and progress was reported. The Government finally abandoned the Bill at the end of the month.

A few days later Lord Salisbury moved in the House of Lords the second reading of the Parliamentary Register and Elections (War Facilities) Bill, the object of which was to make provision for framing a special Register of electors and to facilitate voting by persons on war service, or on munition work, at elections of Members of Parliament during the present war. Lord Lansdowne declared that the Government were entirely in accord with the main principles of the Bill, but pointed out that under the Government Bill, which, as already stated, had been temporarily suspended, more than 90 per cent. of the soldiers over twenty-one years of age would be admitted to the Register. He dwelt again on the difficulty of affording facilities for soldiers to record their votes at the front.

Lord Parmoor urged that the objection to the Government Bill was that it would disfranchise about half the electorate, and that half the men on active service whose opinions were of the greatest worth. Lord Crewe who also spoke for the Government expressed his appreciation of the feeling that the absence of a Register was something of a scandal, but added that what the Military Authorities feared was that the moral effect on the Army of allowing soldiers to vote would be bad. Nevertheless, Lord Salisbury expressed his determination to proceed with the Bill unless the Government introduced one of their own, and the second reading was agreed to.

On the same day a discussion took place in the House of Commons as to the Conferences which had been recently taking place between Ministers and journalists. The special case cited was an invitation which had been issued by Mr. Balfour to members of the Press to come to meet him that afternoon. Sir Henry Dalziel asked for an assurance that the House of Commons should be put in possession, if it wished, of the information which Mr. Balfour was giving in secret to a large number of editors. Mr. Asquith, however, declined to accede to this request offhand, on the ground that if the information was of a secret kind it ought to be given to the House only in secret

session. Later in the evening Sir Edward Carson again commented on the action of Cabinet Ministers in conveying to the Press information which they refused to the House, and expressed a suspicion that it was really an attempt to square the Press. He declared that nothing could be more harmful than an attempt to whitewash a department by statements which were not allowed to be answered or discussed. Procedure of this kind misled and did not inform the people of this country, and it was his conclusion that these secret meetings with the Press aggravated the impossibility of giving information to the House.

The entry of the new Lord Mayor of London, Sir William Dunn, on his term of office on November 9, was celebrated as usual by a Banquet at which important speeches were made by Cabinet Ministers. Mr. Asquith took the opportunity of paying a tribute to the splendid services of our Fleets and Armies and to the gallantry and achievements of our Allies. He referred to the steady progress of the Italian advance upon Trieste accomplished in the teeth of the most formidable difficulties. He welcomed the entrance of Portugal, "our most ancient Ally," into the great contest for European freedom, and expressed the hope that Greece might even yet take her due place among the champions of this cause. He gave an assurance of the hearty sympathy of the British Government "with that great patriot M. Venizelos," and commented on the futility of the German efforts to divide the Allies and break up the united front presented by the friends of freedom joined in one common cause.

Mr. Balfour, who spoke on behalf of the Navy, devoted his remarks to the recent raid in the Channel, and expressed the confident hope that if it was repeated the raiders who entered the Channel would be unable to get out again without heavy disaster. He thought that the public had been "unduly startled" by the recent raid, and he went on to bestow special praise on the British mercantile marine upon which had fallen so heavily the calamities of war. Another notable speech was made by Lord French, who gave the advice "Never think of the end," however near we might have come to the climax.

These speeches emphasised more than ever the solidarity of the nation and their determination to carry on the war to a victorious conclusion. Nevertheless peace propaganda of an unimportant character were occasionally recorded in the newspapers. At Cardiff, for instance, on November 11, an attempt was made to hold a conference in favour of the immediate initiation of negotiations for the purpose of bringing about an early peace. The conference which was organised by a body called the National Council for Civil Liberties, was under the Chairmanship of Mr. James Winstone, President of the South Wales Miners' Federation. The meeting, however, was quickly broken up by the people of Cardiff, who, led by Mr. Stanton, M.P., made a rush into the hall and converted what was intended to

be a pacifist meeting into a meeting for the purpose of repeating the national resolution to prosecute the war at any cost.

The break-up of this meeting was made the subject of a debate in the House of Commons on November 14, when Mr. J. H. Thomas moved the adjournment of the House as a protest against the failure of the Home Office to maintain freedom of speech and conscience. Mr. Stanton stoutly maintained that he and the other loyal citizens of Cardiff were justified in preventing a meeting of notorious pro-Germans who had done all in their power to hinder the progress of the war. Sir Ivor Herbert accused the Home Secretary of playing with public safety by neglecting to use his powers to stop the meeting. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald challenged members to say why rioters should break up a meeting which had been called to pass a resolution declaring that the time had arrived when the objects for which the nation entered the war might be secured by negotiation.

In the course of his reply the Home Secretary said that Mr. MacDonald and his friends were rendering grave disservice to the nation by talking of peace negotiations at the present moment; but in his opinion the objects of the conference were not in themselves illegal, and on the whole he had thought it better, even though some disturbance should take place, not to suppress the Cardiff Conference and thereby expose the Government to the charge of imitating the methods of the enemy.

As the autumn advanced the question of war pensions became vigorously agitated, and on November 14 a Bill for establishing a Board of Pensions to consolidate and simplify the administration of war pensions was introduced in the House of Commons by Mr. Arthur Henderson, the President-designate of the new department. Mr. Henderson based his main argument for the Bill on the overlapping, lack of uniformity, irritating delays in payment, and growing want of public confidence, which resulted from the partition among several departments of the administration of pensions. At the same time he made it clear that the proposed new Board would have no control over the Army Service Pensions or over the Army Service Allowances (some 2,250,000 in number) or over the Navy Flat Rate Pensions and Allowances. These would continue to be administered by the War Office and the Admiralty respectively. The Board, he explained, was to concern itself exclusively with and be responsible for all military pensions, except Service Pensions. The following powers and duties were transferred to it for that purpose:—

1. Those of the Chelsea Commissioners with regard to the grant and administration of disability pensions other than Service pensions.

2. Those of the Army Council with respect to pensions and grants to ex-soldiers, widows and dependants, other than Service pensions.

3. Those of the Statutory Committee so far as they related to the supplementing of pensions and grants, otherwise than out of voluntary funds.

The Board would thus take over the work so far as it related to disability pensions paid from public funds, which had hitherto been done by the War Office, the Tate Gallery, Chelsea Hospital, the Central Army Pay Issue Office and the Office of the Statutory Committee. The total number of cases dealt with in these departments was 27,551 in January last and 78,538 in October; and it was estimated that by March, 1917, the number would have reached 146,244, which would involve a total correspondence between the various sections of 1,378,500 letters. The amalgamation of this work would bring under one control a staff of 1,952 persons. Passing on to the relations of the Statutory Committee and the Board, Mr. Henderson said the Committee would retain the power to supplement separation allowances and Service Pensions to Officers' widows out of private or public funds. An arrangement was to be made whereby either all or part of the money promised by the Treasury would remain at the disposal of the Committee. They would however be restricted to voluntary sources in supplementing disability pensions and grants to widows and other dependants. He hoped to come to an arrangement with the Committee whereby the 300 Local Committees might be improved. One of the first duties of the new Board would be to review the royal warrants which settled scales and questions of payments.

The reception of this Bill was on the whole friendly, though members on both sides of the House regretted that the Admiralty had refused to enter wholly into the scheme. Mr. Ellis Griffith summed up the general feeling of the House when he reminded Dr. Macnamara that the pension for sailors was not an Admiralty pension but a State pension, and suggested that the Department should either be "in for all purposes or out for all purposes."

Although the second reading of the Pension Bill was successfully carried on November 21, its career was destined to be prematurely cut short. At the commencement of the Committee stage on November 27, an amendment was moved by Mr. Hogge, the object of which was to change completely the structure of the Bill by setting up a single unified and centralised pensions scheme on the following lines:—

1. There would be a Board consisting of a Pensions Minister responsible to Parliament, and an Under-Secretary.

2. The Minister would exercise the powers of the Chelsea Commissioners, the Army Council and the Admiralty in regard to pensions.

3. This authority would have power to promulgate new royal warrants.

4. The Statutory Committee would be taken over.

Mr. Henderson warmly defended the Bill in opposition to

Mr. Hogge's amendment. He urged especially the retention of the Statutory Committee and the exclusion of the Admiralty from the scheme. He recommended the Bill as adopting a middle course; but the sense of the House was now plainly against him, and the Government's plan was severely criticised by a number of members from the Unionist, Liberal, Labour and Nationalist benches. So clear was the feeling of the House that at length after a hurried consultation on the Treasury Bench, Mr. Henderson gave way and accepted the amendment which was carried without a division. He thereupon moved the adjournment of the debate to enable the Government to frame amendments to their Bill which would carry out the wishes of the House. The only condition that he made was that Service Pensions should remain with the Admiralty and the War Office.

On November 15, Mr. Runciman made an important statement in the House of Commons on the Government policy with respect to food supplies and prices. He announced that the Government had decided to appoint a Food Controller with very wide powers. He stated also that a form of war bread was to be instituted, and that the Government were about to take drastic powers to deal with milk and potatoes. The Government proposed to assume the new powers necessary for this purpose by an Order in Council the following day under the Defence of the Realm Act. These new powers were as follows: The Government would avail themselves of provisions enabling them to proceed against any person who might waste or unnecessarily delay any article. Power was sought to prescribe the purpose for which an article should or should not be used. As an illustration, Mr. Runciman said, that it was proposed to issue an Order stopping the practice of giving whole milk to pigs. The manufacture of certain articles of food was to be controlled. This was intended to apply particularly to flour. The Government had decided that 70 per cent. of flour could not now be permitted. Pure white flour would not be milled in future. The Local Government Board would make regulations requiring millers to produce only a straight bread flour. Powers were also to be taken to deal with the mode of sale and distribution of the article, and this power would include the authority to embark at once, if it became necessary, upon a policy of food tickets. Market operations were to be regulated and prices were to be fixed where the Government could do so. Mr. Runciman explained that maximum prices could be fixed in the case of flour, sugar, and certain forms of meat. In some other cases, such as milk, the Government could limit an increase of price after ascertaining the cost of production.

Mr. Runciman would not give a final opinion on the suggestion that the whole wheat crop should be taken over at a fixed price. He warned the House that the Government might have to take steps in the way of State Control which would cause discomfort and discontent in some quarters, and appealed to the

people at home to shoulder their burden manfully for the sake of the common cause. He declared that the strain which we should have to bear next year would fall primarily on food supplies. The Sugar Commission had already decided that a further reduction in the issue of sugar had become inevitable. The whole of the luxurious use of sugar must be kept down. This new scheme of the Government was well received by the House, although Sir Edward Carson and other members suggested that it was not drastic enough to meet the necessities of the case.

When the discussion of the subject was resumed on November 16, Sir John Simon and Mr. Churchill laid the blame for the present situation of food supplies and prices on the Government. Sir John Simon in particular attacked the War Office, which he said, either through ignorance or in obedience to popular clamour, had neglected the warnings of the Boards of Trade and Agriculture and had depleted essential industries of their labour. The plans of the Government would be useless unless these two Boards were placed on level terms with the Military Authorities in regard to the withdrawal of men. Sir John Simon urged the Government to get rid of the stupid fallacy that every man added to the Army was necessarily an addition to the strength of the country. To put too much of our national resources into the purely military channel when peace might be far off and victory might depend on staying power, was the one way in which he thought we might lose the war.

This opinion, however, was challenged by Mr. Churchill, who ascribed the shortage of labour in essential industries more to the unchecked and indiscriminate recruiting which went on under the so-called voluntary system than to any adoption of conscription; but he attacked the Government for their tardiness in bringing forward these proposals. He said that as in conscription, so in the regulation of food, the Government had to be driven inch by inch. He expressed the belief that before the war ended, all shipping would have to be taken over, all important employments would have to be regulated by the State, ration tickets issued for everything that mattered, prices fixed, universal service instituted for industry as well as the Army, and Agriculture nationally organised. Why, he asked, should not the Government take these steps now instead of waiting to be driven by necessity?

In the course of his reply, Mr. Runciman pointed out with regard to the alleged submarine peril that the war risks insurance scheme was solvent on a 1 per cent. basis. The real diminution in our tonnage for food carrying was due to the claims of the Navy and the Army. Freights, he contended, played a very small part in producing high prices of food. The new fact which had given rise to the present situation was the failure of the North American harvest for this year. This was compelling us to send to Australia for our wheat, and the longer voyage reduced the carrying power of the mercantile fleet by two-thirds.

The new regulations framed by the King in Council in accordance with the scheme described by Mr. Runciman were published in the *London Gazette* on November 17. They embodied all the proposals which have already been described. No time was lost in taking advantage of the new powers which had been assumed, for on November 20 two important Orders were issued by the Board of Trade, one of them fixing a maximum price for milk and the other specifying the percentage of flour which must be milled from various kinds of wheat in order to obtain the standard flour aimed at by the Board of Trade. The Price of Milk Order (1916) imposed a double limit on prices. The price was not to be raised above that paid on November 15, 1916, nor was it to exceed by more than a specified amount the price in the corresponding month before the war. This amount in the case of retail milk was 2*d.* per quart, and the Order came into force at once.

On November 29 Lord Dunraven opened a debate in the House of Lords on the alleged danger of a deficiency of food, and Lord Crawford announced the intention of the Government within the next few days to issue further orders for the following purposes: to make the acquisition of land for small allotments and market gardens more easy; to give the Board of Agriculture power acting through the existing allotments authority to enter upon land which was now unoccupied and was not paying rates; to enable the Local Authority in the case of land already occupied to exercise the same rights where consent for the use of the land was given by the owner and the occupier; and finally to authorise the Department to use selected portions of common lands for the production of food, subject to careful safeguards.

The announcement of the German policy of wholesale deportations of Belgians into Germany created great indignation in this country. Such behaviour was clearly in contradiction to all the recognised laws of war, and on November 21 Lord Robert Cecil announced in the House of Commons that the German officer under whose orders these deportations were first carried out was General von Sauberzweig, who in his former post as Military Governor of Brussels was the officer directly responsible for the execution of Miss Cavell. Lord Robert added that where atrocities of this kind were committed by such agents in pursuance of the declared policy of the German Government, mere words by the British Government could be of no avail. Still, he desired that we should join our voice to every appeal that the Belgian Government might make to the judgment and assistance of the civilised world; but the only action which could finally solve this question was to prosecute the war with all our power.

At the same sitting of the House, Mr. James Hope explained that a scheme was being arranged by which small parties of German prisoners could be used on the land, the employer being

responsible for their custody, housing and feeding. All applications for the employment of prisoners of war in any capacity were considered by a sub-Committee at the War Office. This Committee also had under discussion the question of employing prisoners on a large scale on land to be acquired for that purpose.

Personal questions are at all times apt to draw good attendances in the House of Commons. This circumstance was particularly noticeable on November 23 when attention was drawn by Mr. Outhwaite to a speech which had recently been delivered privately by Lord Northcliffe. According to Mr. Outhwaite, Lord Northcliffe had stated in the course of this speech that the Russian forces in the field were less than half the British, and had expressed an opinion of no complimentary nature as to their efficiency. He did not ask that Lord Northcliffe should be prosecuted under the Defence of the Realm Act, but that the same freedom of speech should be enjoyed by all.

The defence of Lord Northcliffe was taken up by Sir Henry Dalziel who denied entirely many of Mr. Outhwaite's statements, and challenged the right of any member to make charges on the strength of mere gossip. He had himself been present when the speech was made and had interpreted it as a warning that the self-complacency of the Government was dangerous to the State. Mr. Lloyd George, who also spoke on behalf of the War Office, refused to believe that Lord Northcliffe had said that the Russian forces at the front were only half of ours, as it was not in the least correct. If anything detrimental to the interests of the State was said, the Government would make no distinction between Lord Northcliffe and anybody else; but they had no evidence that Lord Northcliffe had said anything of the kind, and they certainly could not prosecute on Mr. Outhwaite's statement. Mr. Lloyd George branded the suggestion which Mr. Outhwaite had repeated about the strength of the Russian forces as a reflection on a most gallant Army which had displayed great qualities of courage and endurance. He concluded by warning Mr. Outhwaite that if he made a statement detrimental to the prosecution of the war at a private meeting and evidence was produced he should certainly prosecute him.

On November 21 the House of Lords were occupied with the discussion of a private Bill which was not directly concerned with the war. For on that day Lord D'Abernon moved the second reading of his National Gallery Bill which extended the powers of the Trustees for the sale and loan of superfluous pictures. He said that the great English private collections were rapidly being emptied of their chief treasures by the enormous fortunes made in the United States, and the Trustees of the National Gallery felt bound to take measures to retain a small proportion of them in this country. But the national collections were almost over-supplied with the works of certain masters. Out of 23,000 works, 20,000 were by Turner. The collections would not be sensibly impaired if a certain number

of such examples were sold and funds provided by which the Trustees could save for the nation masterpieces of which it stood badly in need. The chief object of the Bill was to enable such an exchange to be made. Lord Lansdowne accepted the Bill on behalf of the Government, and it was then read a second time.

In the Committee stage of the National Gallery Bill on November 28 Lord Weardale secured the assent of the Government to the insertion of a proviso that no picture should be sold or exchanged without the sanction of the Treasury. The object of the Trustees, he said, was to buy Titians, and that as well as their prices was a matter that should be carefully enquired into. Lord Curzon expressed his objection to any idea that the owners of valuable pictures ought to be taxed as manufacturers were taxed on their war profits. Lord D'Abernon repudiated suggestions which had been thrown out by Lord Portsmouth that the Bill was an attack on the Turner collection, and it then passed through Committee without any further alterations being made.

Attention has been drawn from time to time to the serious labour disputes in Wales, Scotland, and the North of England, which had often caused great anxiety to those responsible for the vigorous prosecution of the war. As the year advanced these disputes became undoubtedly fewer and reached agreement more quickly than had formerly been the case. But they were very far from disappearing altogether. One of the chief centres of trouble was the South Wales coalfield, where in the middle of November once again a serious wages dispute was threatened. The Government now adopted an altogether new method of meeting these difficulties. At the end of the month a new regulation was made under the Defence of the Realm Act, under which, whenever the Board of Trade were of opinion that it was necessary for securing the public safety and the defence of the realm, they should have power to take over any coal-mine in an area to which the regulation applied. It was provided that the owner, agent, and manager of any such mine and every officer or director of a Company which owned it should comply with the directions of the Board of Trade as to the management and uses of the mine; and if he failed to do so should be guilty of a summary offence against these regulations.

The announcement of this new regulation was immediately followed by the publication of an Order providing that from December 1 until further notice the regulation should be applied to the South Wales coalfield, that is to say, to all coal-mines in the counties of Brecon, Carmarthen, Glamorgan, Monmouth, Pembroke, and Radnor. At the same time, the President of the Board of Trade appointed an Inter-departmental Committee representing the Board, Home Office and Admiralty, to advise with regard to directions to be given under the new Order. This Committee met for the first time on the last day of November for the purpose of deciding forthwith outstanding questions as to the general rate of wages in the South Wales coalfield.

On November 29 an interesting statement was made by Mr. Chamberlain on the failure of a German mission to Afghanistan. The mission, he said, consisted of two Indian anarchists, a party of German officers and some Turks. The principal German Officer was the bearer of a letter from the German Chancellor to the Amir, in which the latter was invited to advise how best India might be liberated from British tyranny. The party were arrested on their arrival in Afghanistan and eventually conducted to Kabul where the Amir and his people quickly appraised them at their true value. At the outbreak of the war the Amir had given the Viceroy the most solemn assurances of his intention to preserve neutrality, and Mr. Chamberlain acknowledged with great satisfaction the loyalty he had shown to his pledged word. The Amir had firmly refused the inducements held out to him to forsake his ally, and had used his influence to prevent disturbances on the frontier. He dismissed the mission, some of whom had been captured by the Russians and British after leaving Afghanistan.

At the same sitting of the House, the question of peace intrigues in America was raised by Mr. Ronald M'Neill, who asked the Government whether they would make a public declaration that no question of even a temporary cessation of military operations would be entertained so long as German troops remained in occupation of any territory of the Allies. Mr. Bonar Law, who replied to this question on behalf of the Prime Minister, said that unless and until the question had been considered by the Allies in concert he could make no statement except that the Allies whose territory was in whole or in part occupation of the enemy could be assured of the full support of the British Government.

The feeling which had existed for a long time past that the Government were not using our sea power to the fullest possible extent issued in the middle of November in a general debate in the House of Lords on naval strategy and control. The question was raised by Lord Sydenham who asked to be informed about the plans of the Government for punishing Germany for the action of her submarines. He referred to certain declarations which had recently been made to the effect that the proper naval policy for Britain was a defensive policy. This doctrine, he said, was an absolute negation of all the traditions of the Navy and to adopt it would be to court disaster. Lord Beresford likewise complained that the Foreign Office had taken the control of naval policy and shackled the Fleet. He called for the strengthening of the Board of Admiralty by the substitution of young new blood fresh from the sea for the older men who had been worn out by the exertions of the past two years. "We must attack, and attack, and attack," he said; "we are taking far too much care of our Fleet; give it a free hand."

Lord Crewe devoted the greater part of his reply for the Government to an examination of the arguments for and against

making declarations of intention to punish the enemy before he was beaten. His conclusion was that the only voices which could speak with influence now were the voices of the guns along the front, and that it was unwise to attempt so soon to establish a policy of ultimate punishment. He assured the House that the War Committee had for some time been considering the question of arming the mercantile marine against submarines, and also that "considerable success" had been achieved by the Navy in dealing with Germany's new submarines. On the larger question he refused to believe that the Admiralty had abandoned the view that the destruction of the enemy's Fleet was the first object of naval policy.

Meanwhile, rumours had been circulated that Sir Douglas Haig's freedom of action was hampered in various ways by the Cabinet at home,—that changes were insisted upon, and individuals imposed upon him without his consent or approval. In the House of Lords on November 28 Lord Derby gave an emphatic denial to these rumours and declared that the Army Council had complete confidence in Sir Douglas Haig. They believed that the best way of showing that they had such confidence was to fall in, as far as they possibly could, with any and every suggestion that he might make to secure the greater efficiency of the Army under his control. The reports that friction existed between the Army Council or individual members of it and Sir Douglas Haig were untrue. "We have a combination," Lord Derby continued, "of Sir Douglas Haig, Commander in the Field, and Sir William Robertson, Chief of the General Staff, which cannot be equalled and much less improved." It was the one desire of everybody in the War Office, from Mr. Lloyd George downwards, to do what they could to help a combination which they believed would ensure success for our arms.

The concrete case which had given rise to this question in the House of Lords was the appointment of Sir Eric Geddes, a civilian, to replace a Military Officer on the lines of communication in France, and it had been suggested that this appointment had been made without the approval of the Military Authorities on the spot. Lord Derby said on this point that the proposal for the appointment of Sir Eric Geddes to look after all questions of railways, docks and inland water transport had come from Sir Douglas Haig himself, and had been approved by Mr. Lloyd George. Sir Douglas Haig's idea was, to use his own words, "to employ individuals in war on work which they have been accustomed to perform in peace." There was no connection between the appointment of Sir Eric Geddes and the resignation of Sir Frederick Clayton of the office of Inspector-General, Lines of Communication.

On the last day of November the subject of peace was again mentioned in the House of Commons. Lord Robert Cecil took the opportunity to read the text of a telegram which Viscount Grey had sent to Mr. Taft on the occasion of a banquet in New

York held by the League to Enforce Peace. In the course of this telegram Viscount Grey had expressed his sincere desire to see a League of Nations formed and made effective, to secure the future peace of the world *after the end of the present war*. It was clear enough at this sitting of the House that the feeling among members was likely to be very unfavourable to the reception of the peace proposals shortly to be made by Germany.

As already stated, all the collieries in South Wales and Monmouthshire passed into the possession of the Board of Trade on December 1. On the previous day the Executive Council of the South Wales Miners' Federation held a meeting in which they reiterated their demand for a 15 per cent. advance of wages, and protested against the action of the Government in singling out the Welsh coalfield alone, claiming that any such proposal should be dealt with on general lines. The Executive Council met again on December 1, but were unable to agree to any definite policy for submission to the Delegates' Conference which was to be held a few days later. They passed a resolution, however, stating that although the workmen were unable to accept anything less than the increase of 15 per cent., their representatives were prepared to supply at once any further information in support of the workmen's demands which might be required. It became at length clear that the pits would certainly be stopped if the demands of the men were not conceded; and on December 3 it was announced that the Government had settled the wage dispute and removed the danger of a strike by granting the demand of the miners for a 15 per cent. advance in the general wage rate. The concession was not made a moment too soon.

Some further measures were taken with regard to man power at the beginning of December. The Local Government Board issued to Tribunals a memorandum stating that the Government after a careful survey of the situation had come to the definite conclusion that, with regard to cases which came before the Tribunals on grounds of business or employment with certain exceptions, every man under twenty-six years of age who was fit for general service was of more value to the country with the Forces than he would be in civil employment. The exceptions applied only to certain skilled occupations and work of high national importance in which the men would obviously be irreplaceable. A few days later it was officially announced that the Admiralty, the Ministry of Munitions, and the Army Council had reached an agreement to secure at an early date the release for military service of semi-skilled and unskilled men of military age now engaged in the manufacture of munitions. For the time being, the Military Authorities intended to call to the colours such of these men up to thirty-one years of age as might be fit for general service, but instructions were issued to employers with regard to the general withdrawal of exemptions from all semi-skilled and unskilled men of military age.

On November 30 Lord Derby, in the House of Lords, moved the second reading of a Bill establishing the position of the Volunteers. In the course of his speech he said that it was now recognised that the Volunteers, formerly the safety-valve of patriotism, ought to be recognised as part and parcel of the defence of the country. He asked the Volunteers to believe that it was the intention of the Government that not a single man among them should lose his civil employment. He would not be required to leave his home save for the actual defence of the country. The main provision of the Bill was to authorise His Majesty to accept the offer of any member of a Volunteer Corps, to enter into an agreement that for a period, not exceeding the duration of the present war, he would attend such drills and undergo such training as might be specified in the agreement. If a Volunteer who had entered into any such agreement failed to comply with its terms, he became liable to be taken into military custody and dealt with as though he had committed the offence of absence without leave under the Army Act. While engaged in performing any military duty the Volunteer was subject to military law as a soldier. Those who undertook the obligation were to receive a pecuniary grant, but no uniform or equipment until they had put in forty drills of an hour each in three months or else an equivalent efficiency test. Khaki was to be the colour of all new uniforms. There would be a capitation grant of £2 and the men must be passed on a medical standard equal to C1 (service at home). The War Office would provide each battalion with a paid Adjutant, Sergeant-Major, and Colour-Sergeant Musketry Instructor, all with full experience. When this system became established Lord French would take the Volunteers as part of the Defence Forces subject to the efficiency test.

Lord French followed Lord Derby with a tribute to the old Territorials and the new Volunteers. He said that he had spent eight Sundays recently inspecting Volunteers and had seen over 100,000 men. He and his Staff had formed a very high opinion of their value. As to the duties of the new arm many battalions would probably make arrangements to guard some of the positions or vulnerable towns in their neighbourhood. He ended by declaring earnestly that the terrible tax on the national manhood levied by modern war made it necessary that every man who could bear a rifle should train and so be ready to relieve a man to go abroad. The Bill passed through the Committee of the House of Lords on December 7.

As early as the end of November the events began to mature which ultimately issued in a complete reconstitution of the Government. As in the case of the overthrow of the Liberal Government in 1915, so in the present case, the first premonitory signs took place at the Admiralty. Throughout November, as already recorded, criticism had been becoming more frequent, calling for new blood at the Admiralty and for a closer associa-

tion between that Department and the sailors afloat. During the last week of the month rumours were persistently circulated and gradually crystallised into common knowledge that certain important changes were about to be made. The nature of these changes was announced by Mr. Balfour in the House of Commons on November 29 in reply to a question by Commander Bellairs. The First Lord then stated that Admiral Sir John Jellicoe would become First Sea Lord in place of Admiral Sir Henry Jackson. Vice-Admiral Sir David Beatty had already assumed command of the Grand Fleet in succession to Sir John Jellicoe, while Admiral Sir Henry Jackson had been appointed to the vacant post of President of the Royal Naval College, Greenwich. Mr. Balfour intimated that the decision involving these appointments was taken some time previously, but that for military reasons the announcement had been delayed. The consequential changes in the Board of Admiralty and in the higher Naval commands would be announced later.

On December 1 a crowded meeting was held at the Cannon Street Hotel under the auspices of the British Empire Union, at the end of which a resolution was unanimously passed calling upon the Government to set free the British Navy to exercise to the full all its lawful sea powers. The resolution, which was moved by Lord Beresford and seconded by Mr. Gibson Bowles, demanded the instant adoption of measures for dealing with the submarine and mine menace to over-sea trade. It demanded also that a more effectual blockade be enforced and that British merchant vessels be so armed as to enable them to defend themselves against piratical attacks.

Further changes in the Board of Admiralty were announced on December 6. Admiral Sir Cecil Burney, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., became second Sea Lord in place of Vice-Admiral the Hon. Sir Somerset A. Gough-Calthorpe, while Captain Lionel Halsey, C.B., C.M.G., succeeded Commander Cecil F. Lambert as fourth Sea Lord. This appointment was specially interesting to the Dominions on account of the fact that Captain Halsey had been Captain of the battle-cruiser *New Zealand* during her successful empire and world cruise in 1913. He had also been in command of the *New Zealand* in the actions of the Heligoland Bight and the Dogger Bank.

The defeat of Rumania and capture of Bukarest shed a gloom over the country which was proportionate to the hopes that had been raised when that nation entered into the war. For a long time past much dissatisfaction had been expressed with the manner in which the Cabinet and the War Committee had directed the war, and the sentiment prevailing at the beginning of December was from many points of view extremely favourable to schemes of reconstruction. The War Committee at this time consisted of seven members, namely, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Balfour, Mr. McKenna, Lord Curzon, and Mr. Montagu. It was a Committee of the Cabinet,

and its decisions were subject to confirmation by the full Ministerial body of twenty-three. As in the case of the establishment of the Coalition Government, eighteen months previously, the disruption did not arise from any hostile vote in the House of Commons, but from dissensions within the Cabinet itself. The crisis was precipitated by a letter which Mr. Lloyd George addressed to the Prime Minister on December 1, informing his chief that he could not continue to remain a member of the Government unless the machinery for directing the war was drastically overhauled. Mr. Lloyd George urged in particular that the conduct of the war should be placed in the absolute control of a War Committee, consisting of not more than four members, including himself, Sir Edward Carson, Mr. Bonar Law, and a Labour Member, but not including Mr. Asquith. To this suggestion the Prime Minister found himself unable to accede, and on December 3 it was officially announced that Mr. Asquith had advised His Majesty to consent to a reconstruction of the Government. Next day he stated in the House of Commons that the King had approved of reconstruction. At the same time he made it plain that, whatever change of Government might take place, no departure would be involved from the policy announced and pursued since the beginning of the war.

It appeared for a moment as though reconciliation might be obtained even at the eleventh hour. Mr. Asquith claimed that the Prime Minister ought to preside over the meetings of the War Committee. Mr. Lloyd George, on the other hand, held that the War Committee was bound to sit day by day in permanent session, and that the Prime Minister had to perform so many high duties unconnected with the immediate conduct of the War that he could not possibly spare the time for the efficient discharge of the functions of a member of the War Committee. Mr. Lloyd George, however, was ready to accept the principle that the Prime Minister should attend the War Committee in an advisory and consultative capacity with the power of veto for ultimate reference to the Cabinet. This variation in Mr. Lloyd George's original proposal was at first accepted by Mr. Asquith, but later on refused. Mr. Lloyd George thereupon resigned on the morning of December 5. Ministerial complications immediately supervened, and a few hours later Mr. Asquith also tendered his resignation to the King. The same evening His Majesty summoned Mr. Bonar Law to an audience and invited him to form an Administration. It was known that Mr. Bonar Law had given general support to Mr. Lloyd George in his proposals for a reconstruction, and it was believed that the leader of the Unionist Party might succeed in forming an Administration. This, however, he found himself unable to do. On December 6 he intimated his failure to the King, who then sent for Mr. Lloyd George and requested him to carry out the task which had been abandoned by Mr. Bonar Law. It appeared that Mr. Bonar Law had taken the view that a stable Adminis-

tration under his leadership could not be formed without a considerable Liberal representation; and it was soon made clear to him that this could not be secured unless Mr. Asquith was associated with the new Government. A suggestion was put about that Mr. Asquith might possibly accept the office of Lord Chancellor, but after a conference with his chief Liberal colleagues at 10 Downing Street, it became known that Mr. Asquith had definitely declined to serve under Mr. Bonar Law.

Mr. Lloyd George immediately accepted the King's invitation to form a new Ministry, being assured of the co-operation of Mr. Bonar Law; and set about, without delay, to execute the task which had been entrusted to him. It soon became apparent that he was confident of success in his endeavour, for on December 7 he again had an audience of the King, accepted His Majesty's offer of the post of Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury, and kissed hands upon his appointment. It was understood that one of Mr. Lloyd George's first acts was to invite the co-operation of the Labour Party. Meetings were held by the Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive, in the course of which Mr. Henderson strongly recommended his followers to throw in their lot with Mr. Lloyd George. In this he was stoutly supported by Mr. Brace and Mr. George Roberts, the Labour representatives in the last Government, and also by Mr. Wardle, the acting Chairman of the Party in the House of Commons. In the end it was decided by the votes of the majority to take part in the new Government, and a resolution was passed expressing the hope that an effort would now be made to settle the Irish question in order to bring about the widest measure of co-operation of all the forces and energies of the nation and Empire. Mr. Lloyd George was assured from the start of the united support of the Unionist Party, and although fears were at first expressed as to the attitude of the Liberals it speedily became clear that they also were prepared to support the new Administration. The Liberal War Committee, indeed, met under the Chairmanship of Sir Frederick Cawley and passed a resolution pledging itself to active support of Mr. Lloyd George in his efforts to form a new Administration. On December 8 a meeting of Liberal Members of both Houses of Parliament was held at the Reform Club, in the course of which Mr. Asquith explained the reasons for his resignation, and announced his intention of taking his seat on the front opposition bench. This did not mean, however, any intention of hampering the work of the new Government or of withholding support from it in the conduct of the war. A resolution was passed thanking Mr. Asquith for his long and magnificent services to the nation, expressing unabated confidence in him as the leader of the Liberal Party, and also recording the determination to give support to the King's Government engaged in the effective prosecution of the war.

The official list of the new Government was issued on the

evening of December 10. It involved in various ways an almost revolutionary departure from precedent. The War Cabinet consisted of four principal members, none of whom were hampered by any departmental duties. The smallest Cabinet of modern times was thus established in immediate succession of the largest Cabinet of modern times. None of the heads of the great Government Departments were included in the Cabinet, and the important principle was thus realised that the persons responsible for the conduct of the war should be wholly free from any other ties and duties. The four chief members of the War Cabinet were as follows:—

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury—Mr. Lloyd George.

Lord President of the Council and leader of the House of Lords—Lord Curzon.

Without Portfolio—Lord Milner.

Without Portfolio—Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Bonar Law became Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons. He was also to be a member of the War Cabinet, but was not expected to attend regularly, and would not share the same degree of responsibility with the four principal members. The other appointments were as follows:—

Lord Chancellor—Sir Robert Finlay, K.C.

Home Secretary—Sir George Cave.

Foreign Secretary—Mr. Balfour.

Colonial Secretary—Mr. Walter Long.

Secretary for War—Lord Derby.

Secretary for India—Mr. Chamberlain.

President of the Local Government Board—Lord Rhondda.

President of the Board of Trade—Sir Albert Stanley.

Minister of Labour—Mr. Hodge.

First Lord of the Admiralty—Sir Edward Carson.

Minister of Munitions—Dr. Addison.

Minister of Blockade—Lord Robert Cecil.

Food Controller—Lord Devonport.

Shipping Controller—Sir Joseph Maclay.

President of the Board of Agriculture—Mr. R. E. Prothero.

President of the Board of Education—Dr. H. A. L. Fisher.

First Commissioner of Works—Sir Alfred Mond.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster—Sir Frederick Cawley.

Postmaster-General—Mr. Albert Illingworth.

Pensions Minister—Mr. George Barnes.

Attorney-General—Sir F. E. Smith, K.C.

Solicitor-General—Mr. Gordon Hewart, K.C.

Secretary for Scotland—Mr. Munro.

Lord Advocate—Mr. J. A. Clyde, K.C.

Solicitor-General for Scotland—Mr. T. B. Morison, K.C.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland—Lord Wimborne.

Chief Secretary for Ireland—Mr. H. E. Duke.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland—Sir Ignatius O'Brien, K.C.

In this list of appointments only four members of the late Government remained in charge of their old Departments: Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Duke, and Sir F. E. Smith. Ten members in all of the late Cabinet remained in office and twelve retired, including one Unionist (Lord Lansdowne) and eleven Liberals: Mr. Asquith, Lord Buckmaster, Lord Crewe,

Mr. Herbert Samuel, Viscount Grey, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Montagu, Mr. Runciman, Mr. McKinnon Wood, Mr. Tennant, and Mr. Harcourt.

The new War Cabinet met for the first time on December 9 and sat all day. It was understood that it would continue to meet daily and would be virtually in permanent session. There were many novel features in this new scheme, especially that by which the Prime Minister would no longer act as leader of the House of Commons, and also the association with the work of Government of business men and other experts who owed none of their success in their own spheres of knowledge to politics, and who in several cases were not members of either House of Parliament. Among these were Sir Albert Stanley, who had previously directed the London Underground Railway and Motor Omnibus system, and who now went to the Board of Trade; Lord Rhondda, the most influential of the South Wales coal-owners, who went to the Local Government Board; and also business men for the new offices of Food Controller and Shipping Controller. Dr. H. A. L. Fisher, the new President of the Board of Education, was a distinguished scholar and historian, and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sheffield. Mr. Prothero also, the new President of the Board of Agriculture, although a member of the House of Commons, had won his reputation from his wide culture and special knowledge of agriculture rather than on any political grounds. The Labour Party were represented by Mr. Henderson in the War Cabinet, and also by Mr. Hodge and Mr. George Barnes, who were both placed at the head of entirely new Departments. Of the thirty-three names embodied in the list of the new Government, fifteen were Unionists, twelve Liberals, three Labour Members, and three members of neither House of Parliament.

The list of Under-Secretaries was not made public until December 15. They were as follows:—

Parliamentary Secretaries, Munitions—Sir L. Worthington Evans and Mr. Kellaway.

Parliamentary Secretary, Admiralty—Dr. T. J. Macnamara.

Civil Lord, Admiralty—Mr. Pretyman.

Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education—Mr. Herbert Lewis.

Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Trade—Mr. G. H. Roberts.

Parliamentary Secretary, Local Government Board—Mr. Hayes Fisher.

Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Agriculture—Sir R. Winfrey.

Under-Secretary, Home Office—Mr. William Brace.

Under-Secretary, Colonies—Mr. Steel-Maitland.

Under-Secretary, India—Lord Islington.

Under-Secretary, War Office—Mr. J. I. Macpherson.

Finance Secretary, War Office—Mr. Forster.

Assistant Postmaster-General—Mr. Pike Pease.

Lord Steward of the Household—Lord Farquhar.

Treasurer of the Household—Col. James Craig.

Controller of the Household—Sir Edwin Cornwall.

Lord Chamberlain of the Household—Lord Sandhurst.

Vice-Chamberlain of the Household—Mr. A. C. Beck.

Captain of the Gentlemen at Arms—Lord Colebrooke.

Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard—Lord Suffield.

Master of the Horse—Lord Chesterfield.

Lords in Waiting—
 Lord Herschell.
 Lord Kenyon.
 Lord Stanmore.
 Lord Ranksborough.
 Viscount Valentia.
 Lord Hylton.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Air Board—Major Baird.

Parliamentary Secretaries to the Treasury (joint)—Lord Edmund Talbot and the Hon. Neil Primrose.

Lords of the Treasury—Mr. J. F. Hope, Mr. Stephen Walsh, and Mr. Pratt.

A week later further appointments were announced to vacant Parliamentary Secretaryships, viz. :—

Ministry of Pensions—Col. Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen.

Shipping Controller—Sir L. G. C. Money.

Ministry of Blockade—Rt. Honble. Frederick Leverton Harris.

Ministry of Labour—Mr. Bridgeman.

Although the Liberal Party in the House of Commons were prepared to support the new Government, widespread regret was expressed upon the retirement of Mr. Asquith, and votes of confidence in his continued leadership were passed by Liberal Federations in all parts of the country. This circumstance was interpreted in various quarters as implying lukewarm support of Mr. Lloyd George. As already stated, however, the new Prime Minister had at his back the solid strength of the Liberal War Committee in the House of Commons. The Welsh Liberals also, thirty in number, who would commonly have been classed as extreme Radicals, met on December 11, with Sir Herbert Roberts in the chair, and passed resolutions pledging the Welsh Liberal Parliamentary Party to the active support of the new Government, and offering their most cordial congratulations to their fellow-countryman, Mr. Lloyd George, on his accession to the highest office in the Empire.

The first concern of Mr. Lloyd George on coming into power was to address a letter to every member of the House of Commons, stating that the predominant task before the Government was "the vigorous prosecution of the war to a triumphant conclusion," and expressing confidence in the support of members so long as the Government devoted their energies effectively to that end. The first meeting of the House of Commons under the Premiership of Mr. Lloyd George and the Leadership of Mr. Bonar Law took place on December 12. The front opposition bench was chiefly taken up by the members of the late Government, who had been omitted from the new one, but the seating of the House showed little connexion with Party lines. A large body of Unionists retained their old seats on the opposition side, and the Liberal members who desired to follow Mr. Asquith across the floor of the House found the accommodation inadequate for their numbers. No business of importance was transacted. Mr. Lloyd George was precluded by illness from making his expected statement, which accordingly was postponed until December 19.

The establishment of the new Ministries of Labour, Food,

and Shipping necessitated the introduction of a "New Ministries and Secretaries Bill," the second reading of which was moved by Sir George Cave on December 18. In the course of his speech, Sir George mentioned that Lord Devonport had taken the matter of food control thoroughly in hand. He would act in close co-operation with the Board of Agriculture in regard to home supplies and with the Wheat and Sugar Commissions in regard to foreign supplies. Lord Devonport would further be able to supplement the action of those bodies as he thought necessary. In justifying the appointment of a Parliamentary Secretary to the Air Board, Sir George Cave intimated that the Government wanted to get still further. The matter was of pressing importance and many wished to have a decision on the position of the Air Board. The work of President was still being carried on by Lord Curzon, and the Government had satisfied themselves that the Service was not suffering in the meantime, while the War Office and the Admiralty had arranged to utilise to the full the services of the Air Board.

Some criticism was raised by Mr. McKenna and Mr. Dillon before Mr. Bonar Law replied to the argument which had been urged, that Sir Joseph Maclay, the Shipping Controller, ought to be a member of the House of Commons. Mr. Bonar Law regarded the suggestion as contrary to the whole spirit in which Ministers were trying to run the Government under the new system. What they wanted was to get the work done. The Shipping Controller had told him that he did not think he could perform his duties and also work in the House of Commons at the same time. The Government wanted him to do the work which was most important, and they would make the best arrangements they could to defend in the House of Commons what he had done. The Shipping Controller had brought forward definite proposals upon which he and the Admiralty were now working. If they did not come to the same conclusion the War Cabinet would have the whole case before them and quickly decide between them. Mr. Bonar Law also referred to the position of Sir Albert Stanley, the President of the Board of Trade. He said that Sir Albert had not been appointed to that post because of any Parliamentary gifts. He was going to the Board of Trade to do the work there and not to defend what he did in the House of Commons. Accordingly he had suggested that an additional Under-Secretary, for whose appointment the Government now sought power, would free his hand. The Bill was then read a second time. At the Committee stage on the following day an amendment was moved by Sir George Cave inserting a clause which established an Air Board, to consist of a President and other members. The President would be deemed to be a Minister and the Air Board a Ministry. The clause was inserted in the Bill which shortly afterwards passed into law.

As regards the labour situation in the country, the month of

December marked another important strike, namely, that of the boilermakers in the Port of Liverpool. The grievances of the men arose out of an award given by the Committee on Production on November 3. They had applied for an advance of 10s. on the ground of the increased cost of living, and they were awarded 3s. as from October 19. The men then handed in their notices, and on December 8 held a mass meeting in which their responsible leader urged them to withdraw their notices and to adopt one of two courses for the purpose of reaching a compromise: either go to arbitration under the Munitions of War Act, or arrange for a conference between their representatives and the Mersey shipowners, with a view to an agreement being made which could be approved by the Ministry of Munitions. In spite of this appeal of their leader the majority of the men went on strike the following day; and it may be added that many of them had already refused for nearly five weeks past to work overtime. A further meeting was held on December 13, when they were again urged by their leaders to return and again refused. At the same time the Minister of Labour, Mr. Hodge, who had just taken up his new duties, sent a telegram expressing the regret which he felt in finding that his first duty was to deal with a strike. Seeing that the strike was in violation of the provisions of the Munitions Act, Mr. Hodge stated that it was impossible for him to deal with the men until they resumed work. The day after work was resumed he would be prepared to meet a deputation and give them a full opportunity of stating their grievances, and he would act promptly and impartially upon the case which they presented. But he strongly emphasised the fact that a resumption of work must precede discussion.

In spite of this the men remained on strike, notwithstanding the fact that Admiralty work of the most vital national importance was being delayed by their action. Accordingly, the Government issued a notice drawing the attention of all persons concerned to the Defence of the Realm Regulations governing the matter, and expressing their intention of dealing with the situation drastically under the powers conferred upon them by the Munitions of War Act and the Defence of the Realm Act. The dispute was still outstanding at the end of the year.

In the midst of the turmoil created by the change of Government there occurred one of the most important landmarks in the history of the war; for on December 13 it was announced in England that Germany had for the first time made direct overtures of peace to the Allies. The Note which she addressed to the Allied countries was sent through the Neutral Powers, and was not actually received till some days later. The first intimation of the new German move was received in this country through the wireless press report of a speech by the Imperial Chancellor in the Reichstag and recorded fully in the chapter on German history. The wording of the Chancellor's speech,

in which he referred to the victories of Germany and in no complimentary terms to the Allies, was such as to insure an unfavourable reception to the proposals, even if their substance had been approved, which was very far from the case. On December 19, Mr. Lloyd George made his expected statement of the policy of the new Government in a crowded House of Commons; and in this declaration, important from every point of view, he began by a reference to the Imperial Chancellor's speech of a few days previously. He stated that the German Note, which had by this time been received, was practically a reproduction of the speech of Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg. It had already been discussed informally between the Allies who had each independently arrived at identical conclusions. Before giving favourable consideration to a Peace Conference, they held that they ought to know whether Germany was prepared to accept the only terms on which it was possible for peace to be obtained in Europe. Those terms were, Mr. Lloyd George said, restitution, reparation, and guarantee against repetition. He expressed his view that the Note and the speech which heralded it afforded us small scope for an honourable and lasting concord. The mere words that lured Belgium to her destruction would not satisfy Europe any more. "We shall put our trust in an unbroken Army rather than in a broken faith." To enter a conference on the invitation of Germany proclaiming herself victorious without any knowledge of the proposals she would make, would be to put our heads into a noose with the rope in the hands of Germany.

The Prime Minister then passed to a brief review of the military position. He admonished his hearers not to expect a speedy victory as a result of the new Administration. He referred to the Rumanian "blunder," and pointed out that even that might have a salutary effect in calling the attention of the Allies to obvious defects in our organisation. Thus it had already been decided to take strong action in Greece and to recognise the agents of that great Greek statesman, M. Venizelos. He spoke of the fighting on the Western Front as full of hope for the future, and full of significance for the foe.

Turning next to the domestic field, Mr. Lloyd George declared that the urgent task in front of the Government was to complete and make even more effective the mobilisation of all our national resources. They felt that the time had come to take more complete control over all ships and to place them practically in the same position as the railways. They would also extend their control over the whole mining industry as they had already done over the South Wales coalfield. On the question of food, the Prime Minister insisted that the problem was serious, and that real sacrifices must be made. The over-consumption of the affluent must not be allowed to create a shortage for the less well-to-do. Every available square yard must be made to produce food; the nation as a whole should

place its luxuries, indulgences, and elegancies on a national altar, and proclaim during the war a national Lent. The Government had come to the conclusion that they could not ask the nation for further sacrifices without taking even more drastic steps to arrest unfair profiteering out of the war ; and measures designed for this end would accordingly be taken.

The Prime Minister then announced the most important feature of his new programme. He referred to Germany's latest move in the mobilisation of the whole population of that country, and insisted that it was necessary that we should reply by a complete mobilisation of the labour reserves of this country. The War Cabinet had therefore come to the conclusion that the time had arrived for the adoption of the principle of universal national service. The Cabinet believed that the plans they had in view would secure to every worker all that he had the right to ask for ; and it was proposed to appoint Mr. Neville Chamberlain, the Lord Mayor of Birmingham, Director-General of National Service.

With regard to the scheme for national civilian service, it was proposed that the Director should proceed by the scheduling of industries and of services according to their essential character during the war. Labour would be set free from non-essential industries and would be available to release potential soldiers and increase the available supply of labour for essential services. This labour would be invited to enrol at once for war work, and the Prime Minister expressed his conviction that an adequate supply of volunteers would be secured when it was realised how essential their service was to the life of the nation. But at the same time he warned the country that if the required numbers were not obtained, the Government would not hesitate to ask Parliament for the necessary powers for rendering their plans fully effective. Towards the end of his speech the Prime Minister announced the decision of the Government to summon an Imperial Conference, to place the whole position before the Dominions and consult with them.

Mr. Lloyd George was immediately succeeded by Mr. Asquith, who began by disclaiming to be in any sense a leader of the Opposition, or even to speak as head of the Liberal Party. He affirmed that his one desire was to give the Government the benefit of whatever experience he had gained. While in some ways it was a relief to be released from the burden of office, he did not conceal his regret that he had been compelled to leave his task unfinished. In the course of a retrospect of his War Administration during the first two and a half years of war, Mr. Asquith emphatically denied that the late Government had failed in a resolute and effective prosecution of the war. He was content to leave his Administration to the judgment of history. Referring to the "so-called peace proposal" he said that it was born of military and economic necessity. He could see nothing in the Note of the German Government which gave

us the least reason to believe that they were in the mood to give the Allies the terms which he and others had declared to be essential. Peace would only come on the terms that atonement was made for past wrong and that paper treaties and the sovereignty of public law were securely entrenched among the nations of the world.

A similar statement to that of the Prime Minister was made by Lord Curzon in the House of Lords on the same day. He said that in many respects the late Government was very efficient and did great things, but the country wanted a more concentrated effort, a more universal organisation, a more thorough use of resources. "This country," he declared, "is not only willing to be led, it is almost calling to be driven." The desires of the country which the Government intended to carry out were these: a vigorous prosecution of the war, a sufficient and ample return for all the sacrifices made, reparation by the enemy for his countless crimes, security against the repetition of those crimes, re-establishment of the peace of Europe on the basis of the free and independent existence of nations, great and small, freedom of Britain from the menace which the triumph of the German arms and the German spirit would contain.

In order to secure these objects, Lord Curzon continued, far greater sacrifices would be called for and far greater restraints of individual conduct and personal liberty would be entailed. But he confidently added that there was no sacrifice to which the nation was not ready to submit, provided it could be shown that the sacrifice was not in vain. Germany was squeezing the last drop out of her manhood; her mass levy was a challenge; we could meet it by organising the whole population of this country.

Lord Curzon was followed by Lord Crewe, who assured the Government of his good wishes, and warned the public not to expect that the War Cabinet would "take a lightning decision every day or possibly twice a day." War, he said, was not quite such a slap-dash business, and it was still easy to lose the war finally in a month by rash action. He was confident, however, that the present Government, while displaying energy and determination, would occasionally engage in the practice of deliberation. He welcomed the announcement of new measures for the mobilisation of national resources. Provided the sacrifices were distributed as equally as possible, he predicted that the country would accept cheerfully the sensible and moderate proposals of the Government.

The new Government thus started its career under excellent auspices, backed by the declared goodwill of nearly all political sections. The item in their programme which attracted more public attention than any other was that which proposed to establish the principle of universal national service. This proposal appeared on the whole to be very well received by the

country. It is to be noted, however, that the principle had been adopted and had been destined shortly to be announced by the late Cabinet of Mr. Asquith; and in fact before Mr. Asquith resigned a Bill had already been drafted preparing for a scheme of universal compulsory service for both men and women. The first business actually transacted in the House of Commons after the establishment of the new Government was the passage of a fresh vote of credit for 400,000,000*l.* which was moved by Mr. Bonar Law on December 14. Mr. Bonar Law estimated that the total amount of votes of credit for the financial year would reach 1,950,000,000*l.*; the Budget Estimate of expenditure for the year was 1,600,000,000*l.*, so that the excess of actual expenditure over the estimate was 350,000,000*l.* The increase of expenditure over the estimate was due to two factors: munitions and loans to our Allies. The new vote was calculated to carry the Government on to February 24. The average daily expenditure at the time when the last vote of credit had been moved by Mr. Asquith was 5,070,000*l.*, but for the last 63 days it had risen to 5,710,000*l.* During this same period of 63 days the loans to Allies had increased by 400,000*l.* a day. Finally, the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that the total expenditure of this country since the outbreak of the war was 3,852,000,000*l.* Although this figure was colossal, he did not regard it as alarming. He did not believe that this war could go on indefinitely like the Napoleonic wars; everything had to be thrown in. The Armies now embodied by the Allies could not be kept at their present figure indefinitely, and all that could be hoped for was that they would be kept at a strong figure long enough to beat our enemies. In the same way we could not hope to go on indefinitely in the financial scale, but he believed that we could go on long enough to make it sure that we were not beaten for financial reasons.

Mr. McKenna also spoke on the vote of credit before it was unanimously agreed to by the House. He assured his successor in the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer that he could on every occasion rely with confidence on his fullest support in his difficult task. He especially emphasised the duty of the House to exceed the estimates to any extent that might be necessary to give a proper supply of munitions to our forces in the field.

The Report stage of the vote of credit which was taken next day furnished the occasion for a debate on the Irish question. Major William Redmond, who was home from the front on short leave, rose from the Nationalist benches to advocate "a new Ireland built up out of the war; with Nationalist and Unionist, Catholic and Protestant, giving up their ancient feuds and united in showing that they could govern Ireland patriotically and well." He said that the troops from Ulster and from the other provinces of Ireland were now in close contact, and he was able to speak of the extremely good feeling that was

displayed between the various sections. These men, he declared, had recognised in the face of the enemy that they were brother Irishmen. No one who had seen the comradeship of the men with the green and orange badges in France could fail to see the lesson which it taught. They came together in the trenches and were friends; all that was needed was to bring them together on the floor of an assembly in Ireland and they would be friends there too. Major Redmond was followed by Colonel M'Calmont, one of the Ulster Members, who insisted that the main cause of anxiety to the Irish soldiers at the front was whether the Irishmen at home were going to keep up the Irish Regiments. He declared that if men were not forthcoming during the next few weeks, the Irish Regiments as such would cease to exist directly the Spring campaign had started. Mr. Bonar Law next expressed his conviction that the desire for a new state of things in Ireland was shared by every man and woman in the United Kingdom. How small were all the incidents which excited us at home, changes of Government and so on, except as an instrument to give support to the men who were risking their lives on our behalf! What had distressed him more than anything else in this war was the way in which young men, the flower of the coming generation, were being wiped out among the assemblies of nations. It was his heartfelt wish that there should be some change in the feeling between Ireland and the rest of the United Kingdom. So far as the people of the United Kingdom were concerned, the one thing that would influence them would be the feeling that the Irish were willing to run the risks that were run by the rest of us.

Throughout December the question of food supply was much before the attention of the public. On the 7th, Mr. Wardle, the Chairman of the Labour Party, presided over a Conference of 860 delegates from Trade Unions, Co-operative Societies, and other labour organisations, which met at the Central Hall, Westminster, to discuss "The war and food prices." A strong plea was set up for more State control, the purchase of all imported essential food-stuffs by the Government, the commandeering or controlling of home products, the commandeering of ships and the controlling of freights and freight rates, the placing on the retail markets of supplies so obtained and controlled at prices which would secure the full benefit of Government action to the consumer.

The appointment of Lord Devonport as Food Controller was officially announced on December 10, but in the preceding three or four weeks many important regulations regarding food had already been issued. A census of potatoes had been established, a new standard of flour and bread had been fixed, the use of wheat in grain was prohibited, maximum prices had been fixed for milk, and meals had been restricted in hotels and other places of public eating. This latter regulation came into

force on December 18, and limited dinners to three courses and luncheons to two courses in all public eating-places. On December 14 Lord Devonport made a statement in the House of Lords on food control. He said that it was not enough to maintain our food supplies, but it was overwhelmingly essential that they should be distributed fairly. He found to his regret evidence that there were many unpatriotic people who got hold of supplies in excess of their wants. His endeavour would always be to adjust supplies coming to this country on the basis that every individual should have an equal chance of getting a fair share.

Turning to the specific case of sugar, Lord Devonport answered the complaint that people could not get their sugar except in insignificant quantities. The only way in which this could be controlled was by rationing. It was clear to him that the use of luxuries must be abated. For example, the flaunting of sugar in extravagant confectionery and cakes would be stopped. It was obvious that a general diminution in the consumption of staple foods was essential, and it might be necessary on fuller investigation to make abstinence compulsory. It may be observed that no technical difficulty was likely to arise in this latter eventuality, for under the New Ministries and Secretaries Bill very wide powers had been conferred upon the Food Controller.

In the discussion of this Bill in Committee of the House of Commons on December 20, Mr. Prothero, the new Minister of Agriculture, took the opportunity to utter a grave warning on the subject of our food supplies. He said that the War Office and the whole country ought to realise that we were a beleaguered city, and that unless we grew our food at home we might meet with the greatest possible difficulties. Mr. Prothero confessed that he was faced with tremendous difficulties, and that labour was one of the greatest of them. The only way in which he could hope to deal with them was by carrying with him the support of the farmers and by obtaining from the War Office some supply of labour. "It is my sincere conviction," he said, "that it may be on the corn fields and potato lands of Great Britain that victory in this great war may be lost or won."

The only important event remaining to be recorded for the year is indeed one of the most significant that had occurred since the beginning of the war. On December 13 it was announced in the newspapers that Germany had for the first time made direct overtures of peace to the Allies. The first intimation of this new move on the part of Germany was in the wireless report of a meeting of the Reichstag in which the Imperial Chancellor described to his audience the line which he had adopted in proposing to the Allies that they should meet for the purpose of peace negotiations. The origin of the note and the economic conditions which induced the Germans to embark upon this new scheme are fully described in the chapter

dealing with Germany, where also the substance of the note is recorded. It need only be mentioned here that its wording was such as to exclude all possibility of sympathetic consideration upon the part of the Allies to whom it was addressed. It stated that Germany and her Allies had won considerable successes at war, and insisted that recent events had demonstrated that a further continuance of the war would not result in breaking Germany's resistance, but that Germany had the military and economic strength to continue the war. The note was further characterised by a professed consideration for humanitarian principles, which, however, appeared to the Allies so greatly at variance with the actions of the Germans as to excite little else than contempt among the Allied countries. The note offered to bring forward propositions which would serve as "a basis for the restoration of a lasting peace." If, however, the Allies were not prepared to negotiate on the assumptions on which the note was based, then Germany and her Allies were "resolved to carry on the war to an end, while solemnly disclaiming any responsibility for this before humanity and history."

This note was addressed in identical terms by Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey to the neutral countries for transmission to the belligerents. It was received in Washington on December 14, and delivered at the British Foreign Office on December 18 by Mr. Page, the United States Ambassador. On the same afternoon it was dealt with as already described by Mr. Lloyd George in his important statement of policy on taking up the office of Prime Minister. Already, however, on the 15th, the Russian Duma had unanimously passed a resolution against the acceptance of the German peace proposals (see history of Russia), and it was clear from the first that in none of the Allied countries was there the smallest chance of any favourable response to the German missive. A note couched in similar terms had been addressed by Germany at the same time to the Pope, but attracted very little attention in any of the Allied countries.

Before any formal answer had been framed to the German overtures for peace negotiations, but after the public feeling in all the Allied countries had manifestly declared itself as strongly hostile to any proposal of the kind, the President of the United States addressed a further note to all the belligerent powers, in the course of which he suggested that an early occasion should be sought for an avowal of their respective views as to the terms upon which the war might be concluded. The substance of this note, which was dated December 20, will be found in the chapter on the United States. It had not the slightest effect in promoting any change of opinion among the Allied countries, but, on the other hand, caused in many quarters a considerable resentment against what was considered an unwarrantable intrusion on the part of President Wilson. Surprise was felt

that he should have taken any measure which appeared to back up the German efforts to obtain peace, in view of the fact that the Governments of France, Russia, and Great Britain had already declared their views in the most unmistakable manner and were clearly supported by public opinion in their own countries. Special annoyance was caused in the Entente countries by the statement of President Wilson that the objects which the spokesmen of the belligerents on both sides had in mind in this war were virtually the same, as stated in general terms to their own people and to the world. "Each side desires to make the rights and privileges of weak peoples and small States as secure against aggression or denial in the future as the rights and privileges of the great and powerful States now at war. Each wishes itself to be made secure in the future along with all other nations and peoples against the recurrence of wars like this, and against aggression or selfish interference of any kind. Each would be jealous of the formation of any more rival Leagues to preserve an uncertain balance of power amidst multiplying suspicions; but each is ready to consider the formation of a League of Nations to ensure peace and justice throughout the world." The President went on to suggest that since the declared objects of both sides in continuing the war were the same, the spokesmen on each side should define more precisely the ends which they wished to attain, in the hope that some kind of possibility of agreement might thereupon emerge.

On December 23 the Swiss Federal Council addressed a note to the belligerent powers based on principles similar to those of the American Note; but naturally it was no more capable than its predecessor of effecting any change in the policy of the Allies. The reply of the Allies to the German Peace Note was communicated by the French Government on behalf of the Allied Powers to the United States Ambassador in Paris on December 30, and we herewith give in full the English translation:—

"The Allied Governments of Russia, France, Great Britain, Japan, Italy, Serbia, Belgium, Montenegro, Portugal, and Rumania, united for the defence of the freedom of nations and faithful to their undertakings not to lay down their arms except in common accord, have decided to return a joint answer to the illusory peace proposals which have been addressed to them by the Governments of the enemy Powers through the intermediary of the United States, Spain, Switzerland, and the Netherlands.

"As a prelude to any reply, the Allied Powers feel bound to protest strongly against the two material assertions made in the Note from the enemy Powers, the one professing to throw upon the Allies the responsibility of the war, and the other proclaiming the victory of the Central Powers.

"The Allies cannot admit a claim which is thus untrue in each particular, and is sufficient alone to render sterile all attempt at negotiations.

"The Allied nations have for thirty months been engaged in a war which they had done everything to avoid. They have shown by their actions their devotion to peace. This devotion is as strong to-day as it was in 1914; and after the violation by Germany of her solemn engagements, Germany's promise is no sufficient foundation on which to re-establish the peace which she broke.

"A mere suggestion, without statement of terms, that negotiations should be opened, is not an offer of peace. The putting forward by the Imperial Government of a sham proposal, lacking all substance and precision, would appear to be less an offer of peace than a war manœuvre.

"It is founded on a calculated misinterpretation of the character of the struggle in the past, the present, and the future.

"As for the past, the German Note takes no account of the facts, dates, and figures which establish that the war was desired, provoked, and declared by Germany and Austria-Hungary.

"At The Hague Conference it was the German delegate who refused all proposals for disarmament. In July, 1914, it was Austria-Hungary who, after having addressed to Serbia an unprecedented ultimatum, declared war upon her in spite of the satisfaction which had at once been accorded. The Central Empires then rejected all attempts made by the Entente to bring about a pacific solution of a purely local conflict. Great Britain suggested a Conference, France proposed an International Commission, the Emperor of Russia asked the German Emperor to go to arbitration, and Russia and Austria-Hungary came to an understanding on the eve of the conflict; but to all these efforts Germany gave neither answer nor effect. Belgium was invaded by an Empire which had guaranteed her neutrality and which has had the assurance to proclaim that treaties were 'scraps of paper' and that 'necessity knows no law.'

"At the present moment these sham offers on the part of Germany rest on a 'War Map' of Europe alone, which represents nothing more than a superficial and passing phase of the situation, and not the real strength of the belligerents. A peace concluded upon these terms would be only to the advantage of the aggressors, who, after imagining that they would reach their goal in two months, discovered after two years that they could never attain it.

"As for the future, the disasters caused by the German declaration of war and the innumerable outrages committed by Germany and her Allies against both belligerents and neutrals demand penalties, reparation, and guarantees; Germany avoids the mention of any of these.

"In reality these overtures made by the Central Powers are nothing more than a calculated attempt to influence the future course of the war, and to end it by imposing a German peace.

"The object of these overtures is to create dissension in

public opinion in Allied countries. But that public opinion has, in spite of all the sacrifices endured by the Allies, already given its answer with admirable firmness, and has denounced the empty pretence of the declaration of the Enemy Powers.

"They have the further object of stiffening public opinion in Germany and in the countries allied to her; one and all, already severely tried by their losses, worn out by economic pressure and crushed by the supreme effort which has been imposed upon their inhabitants.

"They endeavour to deceive and intimidate public opinion in neutral countries whose inhabitants have long since made up their minds where the initial responsibility rests, have recognised existing responsibilities, and are far too enlightened to favour the designs of Germany by abandoning the defence of human freedom.

"Finally, these overtures attempt to justify in advance in the eyes of the world a new series of crimes—submarine warfare, deportations, forced labour, and forced enlistment of inhabitants against their own countries, and violations of neutrality.

"Fully conscious of the gravity of this moment, but equally conscious of its requirements, the Allied Governments, closely united to one another and in perfect sympathy with their peoples, refuse to consider a proposal which is empty and insincere.

"Once again the Allies declare that no peace is possible so long as they have not secured reparation of violated rights and liberties, recognition of the principle of nationalities, and of the free existence of small States; so long as they have not brought about a settlement calculated to end, once and for all, forces which have constituted a perpetual menace to the nations and to afford the only effective guarantees for the future security of the world.

"In conclusion, the Allied Powers think it necessary to put forward the following considerations, which show the special situation of Belgium after two and a half years of war.

"In virtue of international treaties signed by five great European Powers, of whom Germany was one, Belgium enjoyed, before the war, a special status, rendering her territory inviolable and placing her, under the guarantee of the Powers, outside all European conflicts. She was, however, in spite of these treaties, the first to suffer the aggression of Germany. For this reason the Belgian Government think it necessary to define the aims which Belgium has never ceased to pursue, while fighting side by side with the Entente Powers for right and justice.

"Belgium has always scrupulously fulfilled the duties which her neutrality imposed upon her. She has taken up arms to defend her independence and her neutrality violated by Germany, and to show that she remains faithful to her international

obligations. On August 4, 1914, in the Reichstag, the German Chancellor admitted that this aggression constituted an injustice contrary to the laws of nations and pledged himself in the name of Germany to repair it.

"During two and a half years this injustice has been cruelly aggravated by the proceedings of the occupying forces, which have exhausted the resources of the country, ruined its industries, devastated its towns and villages, and have been responsible for innumerable massacres, executions, and imprisonments. At this very moment, while Germany is proclaiming peace and humanity to the world, she is deporting Belgian citizens by thousands and reducing them to slavery.

"Belgium before the war asked for nothing but to live in harmony with all her neighbours. Her King and her Government have but one aim—the re-establishment of peace and justice. But they only desire a peace which would assure to their country legitimate reparation, guarantees, and safeguards for the future."

The wording of the above note was generally approved by public opinion in the Allied countries. In many quarters the hope was expressed that its publication in Germany might be the first intimation which had passed the censors of that country of the attitude of the Allied nations and the purpose for which they were carrying on the war. The reply of the Allies to the American and Swiss Notes was not published until the following year; and the close of this incident must therefore be left over to be recorded in the ANNUAL REGISTER for 1917. Though the result of the German proposals was small in the direction hoped for by that country, yet one practical effect has to be recorded. On December 25 the Secretary of State for the Colonies addressed a telegram to the self-governing Dominions, inviting their Prime Ministers to a special War Conference of the Empire. This was to take the form of "a series of special and continuous meetings of the War Cabinet, in order to consider urgent questions affecting the prosecution of the war, the possible conditions on which in agreement with our Allies we could assent to peace with Germany, and the problems which will then immediately arise." For the purpose of these meetings Colonial Prime Ministers would be members of the War Cabinet, and they were earnestly asked to make their arrangements in order to be able to attend not later than the end of February. At the same time it was arranged that India should be represented by the Secretary of State at these sittings of the War Cabinet. The justice of these arrangements for giving a share to the Dominions in deciding upon the terms of peace was made evident by the fact that many of the German Colonies had been captured by Colonial Forces and were in the hands of the Colonial Governments.

Reviewing the year as a whole, it was now apparent that the strength of the Allies in men and material had attained a

higher degree relatively to that of the Germans than any hitherto reached. The outstanding historical events of the year were the passage of the two Military Service Acts, the Irish Rebellion, and the Reconstruction of the Government. Most classes of the community had been called upon to bear sacrifices little anticipated at the commencement of the war. That those sacrifices would be increased in the new year was beyond question. Reference may be made especially to the scheme for introducing universal national service, and to the plans for reducing the consumption of food, which seemed at the end of the year to be imminent. The prospect of these sacrifices, however, appeared to be quite powerless in effecting any modification of the national resolution to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion.

■

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY.

I. FRANCE.

AFTER seventeen months of war the French nation remained completely united in its aims and thoroughly determined to spare no efforts to secure victory. The psychology of the French people at this time will unquestionably prove of great interest to historians. The spirit of the Quadruple Entente was incarnate in France as in no other member of that grand alliance. In Italy, in Russia, and to small extent even in Great Britain, discordant voices were to be heard, but the French were extraordinarily unanimous. The Entente policy was accepted by virtually all Frenchmen, but owing to the intelligence and imagination of the people, and to the high level of education reached by them, interest was far from being limited to the private aims of France, but on the contrary a clear conception of the objects of the alliance as a whole was attained. French patriotism was as intense as ever, and the special interests of France (primarily, of course, the reconquest of Alsace-Lorraine) were naturally never forgotten, but the ideal conceived was something greater and wider than the policy of any individual nation. It was almost universally held in France that the genesis of the war had been exclusively in an outrageous Austro-German crime against civilisation, and the German Government, and not only the German Government but the German people, were regarded in the light of murderous robbers, whom it was essential that the Allied Powers—the Police—should utterly overthrow and subsequently control. The idea of a peace attained by compromise with the enemy was therefore abhorrent to Frenchmen. Decisive victory was deemed to be necessary. And after victory it was hoped to establish and maintain peace in Europe by the might of the Four Allied Powers. The dominion of the continent was to be vested in the four great Allies. French politicians thought that it would be impracticable within any period with which a statesman could deal to re-establish the old Concert of Europe—the Concert of the Six Powers—even if it could be regarded as desirable to admit immediately to friendship and equality a nation responsible for such a disaster to European civilisation. There was, however, no desire to establish any control over the internal

affairs of the hostile states. The Germans were to be left entirely free to develop their own national life, but they, together with the Austrians and the Hungarians, were to lose their power over the subject nationalities, Slavs and others; and were to be rendered incapable of disturbing again the peace of Europe. In international disputes the will of the Quadruple Entente was to prevail, because to resist that will would be futile. This conception was not that of the "balance of power" nor of Europe "divided into two camps," for it was hoped that the coalition fighting for public law would have prevailed over the criminal nations, and rivalry between the coalition and the criminals would no longer be possible. The destinies of Europe were to be under ordered and international control, but the new concert was to be one from which, at least for a term of years, Germany and whatever remained of Austria-Hungary were to be excluded. It was ardently desired that every possible measure should be taken to consolidate the existing accord between the Four Powers.

It was under the influence of these sentiments that the Economic Conference in Paris, shortly to be described, was held, and it is profitable to compare the state of opinion in France with that prevailing in the three great nations to whom France was allied. The English reader will recognise at once that the policy summarised above is identical with that concurrently propounded, in perhaps a slightly less extreme form, by nearly every newspaper in Great Britain. The same views were strongly held by the Progressive Bloc in the Russian Duma, whose intellectual sympathy with France and England was very marked, and ostensibly by the Russian Government; and this policy also had the support of the majority in Italy. On the other hand, in none of these three countries was opinion unanimous. In Russia, in Great Britain, and especially in Italy, there existed small groups composed of extreme Radicals and Socialists who took a different view of the origin of the war, for which they held all the Powers in different ways responsible,—not the Central Empires only. These parties,¹ who mostly held internationalist and pacifist doctrines and who were entirely in sympathy with one another, accordingly desired an immediate peace by negotiation and compromise, and the re-establishment of the full Concert of Europe, including all the six historic Powers. They were also opposed to the idea of a Trade War after the declaration of peace, a project which was now being discussed in France and which was subsequently advocated at the Paris Economic Conference. Now these groups were, of course, very small in both Great Britain and Russia, though less insignificant in Italy, but the point to be observed is that in France no corresponding party existed, the opinions

¹ In Russia and Italy, though of course not in Great Britain, opposition to the war was also forthcoming from a totally different quarter, namely, from the ultra-Conservative groups. (See Russia and Italy.)

in question being held only by a few isolated individuals. In French foreign politics there was no Opposition.

At the opening of the year the financial condition of France, like that of all the other belligerents, was deplorable. France had raised 605,000,000*l.* by means of long-term war loans, but the country's war expenditure, up to January 1, amounted to nearly 1,300,000,000*l.* (See A.R., 1915, p. 204.) A further 595,000,000*l.* had been raised by means of short-term loans, but as will be seen the total amount raised by all the loans did not cover the expenditure. Parliament had voted 1,157,000,000*l.* to be expended on the war up to December 31, 1915, and a further 619,600,000*l.* was voted for the first six months of 1916. Now the French national debt before the war amounted to 1,315,000,000*l.*, and since no part of the war expenditure had been met out of revenue, the nation began the year 1916 with a burden of nearly 2,600,000,000*l.* It may be mentioned that the total indebtedness of Germany at the same date was 2,750,000,000*l.*

During February there was an agitation in the Chamber of Deputies about the method of government in the territory of France known as "the war zone." M. Ferry moved a resolution calling upon the Government to resume direct control in this zone, thus relieving the General Staff of its quasi-civil functions; but the Government resisted this proposal by means of a vote of confidence, which was carried on February 18, after a speech by M. Briand, the Premier, by a majority of 230.

In June an historic Economic Conference of the Allies was held in Paris, at which France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and Belgium were represented, and also Russia. The conference was more than ordinarily important because it resulted in a crystallisation of the policy to which all the Allied Governments had been tending for many months, namely, the policy of regarding the estrangement from Central Europe as permanent, the policy of dividing Europe into two camps in the event of the war resulting in a "draw," and of ostracising the German and Hungarian peoples as the outlaws of the Continent in the event of the Entente being victorious. The conference opened on June 14, and lasted four days. It was opened under the presidency of M. Briand—the President, like the place, being appropriate to the proceedings, since it was the French Government who had been the chief supporters of the ideas expressed. M. Briand made a long opening speech, in which he said that there would be a very much altered world after the war and that in that new world no great importance ought to be attached to old theories and old customs, but that the new realities would have to be regarded. The Allies, he said, had had to face a common danger, and there were therefore no conflicting interests between them, but on the contrary there was to be observed a stubborn determination to meet the menace in a way that would prove of benefit to all who were threatened. If it

were proved that ancient errors permitted the enemy to establish a tyranny over the productive forces of the world, then the errors must be abandoned, and a new policy adopted. Great Britain was represented at the conference by Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Hughes (the Australian Premier), and the Marquess of Crewe.

The subsequent meetings were held under the presidency of M. Clementel, Minister of Commerce, and the resolutions adopted were published simultaneously in the various capitals on June 20. The preamble to these resolutions stated that the Allies were faced with a peril from the preparations being made by the Central Powers to establish a commercial tyranny after the war, and that they (the Allies) were therefore concerting together to take measures to thwart the commercial aims of the enemy countries, and to organise "their economic alliance" on a "permanent basis." The resolutions were grouped under three heads: (1) those relating to Measures for the War Period; (2) to Transitory Measures during the Period of Economic Reconstruction after the War, and (3) to Permanent Measures of Mutual Assistance and Collaboration among the Allies. The resolutions under the first head were for the most part mere truisms which had already been put into practice. These "Measures for the War Period" were as follows:—

"The laws and regulations prohibiting trading with the enemy shall be brought into accord, and for this purpose—

"A. The Allies will prohibit their own subjects and citizens and all persons residing in their territories from carrying on any trade with (1) the inhabitants of enemy countries whatever their nationality, (2) enemy subjects wherever resident, and (3) persons, firms, and companies whose business is controlled wholly or partially by enemy subjects or is subject to enemy influence and whose names are included in a special list.

"B. They will prohibit the importation into their territories of all goods originating in or coming from enemy countries.

"C. They will devise means of establishing a system enabling contracts entered into with enemy subjects and injurious to national interests to be cancelled unconditionally.

"Further,

"Business undertakings owned or operated by enemy subjects in the territories of the Allies will all be sequestered or placed under control; and measures will be taken for the purpose of winding up some of these undertakings and of realising their assets, the proceeds of such realisation remaining sequestered or under control.

"Furthermore,

"The Allies will complete the measures already taken for the restriction of enemy supplies, both in the Mother-countries and in the Dominions, Colonies, and Protectorates, (1) by unifying the lists of contraband and of export prohibition, and particularly by prohibiting the export of all commodities declared absolute or conditional contraband, and (2) by making

grant of licences for export to neutral countries from which export to enemy territories might take place conditional upon the existence in such countries of control organisations approved by the Allies; or, in the absence of such organisations, upon special guarantees, such as the limitation of quantities exported, supervision by Allied Consular officers, etc."

The "Transitory Measures for the Period of Commercial, Industrial, Agricultural, and Maritime reconstruction of the Allied Countries" were five in number. It is not possible in the space available to quote these resolutions verbatim, but their purport was as follows:—

1. The Allies jointly declare that countries spoliated by the enemy shall have prior claim upon the resources of the Allies in the reconstruction which will follow the war.

2. No "most-favoured-nation" treatment shall be granted to enemy countries for a term of years after the conclusion of peace.

3. During the period of reconstruction the natural resources of the Allied countries should be conserved for their mutual benefit, in preference to any other countries.

4. In order to prevent aggressive dumping, the commerce of enemy powers shall be submitted to special treatment, either actual prohibition or other effective measures.

5. The Allies will devise measures for preventing enemy subjects from exercising, in their territories, certain industries or professions which concern national defence or economic independence.

Still more interesting was the series of resolutions under the heading "Permanent Measures of Mutual Assistance and Collaboration among the Allies," because these resolutions revealed the permanent European policy of the Governments concerned, and the state in which the members of those Governments expected the Continent to emerge from the war. They envisaged the Europe of the future as still a Europe divided into two groups of mutually hostile Powers, such as had existed from the date of the Franco-British Entente onwards, but with the difference that one group would be weakened and reduced. The substance of this third series of resolutions was as follows:—

1. The Allies decide to take the necessary steps without delay to render themselves independent of the enemy countries in so far as regards the raw materials and manufactured articles essential to the normal development of their economic activities. These measures should be directed to assuring the independence of the Allies not only so far as concerns their sources of supply, but also as regards their financial, commercial, and maritime organisation. These objects are to be achieved by different methods, "having regard to the principles which govern the economic policy" of the countries concerned, these methods being such as customs duties, state subsidies, or financial assistance for scientific and technical research.

2. In order to permit the interchange of their products the Allies undertake to adopt measures for facilitating their mutual trade relations both by the establishment of direct and rapid land and sea transport services at low rates, and by the extension and improvement of postal, telegraphic, and other communications.

3. In regard to patents, trade-marks, copyrights, etc., the Allies agree to adopt, as far as possible, a uniform procedure, under the advice of technical experts.

The first and second series of resolutions, especially the first, were largely in the nature of platitudes, but it will be seen that the third series was intended to be of a drastic character. The phrase referring to the "principles governing economic policy" was evidently, however, inserted at the wish of the British delegates in order not definitely to commit Great Britain to a permanent abandonment of Free Trade. The policy laid down at this Paris Conference met with all but unanimous approval in France, and at the end of June all the resolutions were formally ratified and adopted by the French Cabinet.

Throughout the year, or at any rate up to the last few weeks of the year, French politics were singularly uninteresting by reason of the fact already mentioned that there existed no Opposition. The political conflicts which occurred never turned upon any difference of opinion about principles, but only upon details of administration, or upon such personal questions as the fitness of particular statesmen for particular posts. In June the Chamber of Deputies sat for seven days in secret committee and thereafter passed a vote of confidence in the Government by 537 votes to 97. The resolution expressing this confidence stated that the Chamber was resolved to co-operate in all possible ways with the Government in prosecuting the war, whilst abstaining from all interference in actual military operations; and recognising that through the Secret Committee the Chamber had become effectively informed upon the conduct of the war, it reserved to itself the right to have recourse again, if necessary, to the same procedure; further, the Chamber decided to institute and organise a direct delegation which should exercise, with the co-operation of the Government, direct and effective control over all the services, the object of which was to provide for the needs of the army.

The rate of French war expenditure constantly increased and at the end of the year had risen to the terrible figure of 3,700,000*l.* per day. During the year war credits to the extent of 1,283,000,000*l.* were voted, that is, considerably more than in the whole of the previous seventeen months; and the total war credits covering the period up to December 31 thus amounted to 2,440,000,000*l.* Thus the French national debt at the end of the year was not far short of four milliard sterling. (See above, page 218.)

On September 19, a somewhat dramatic sitting of the

Chamber of Deputies was held. A certain M. Brizon, one of the minute group of two or three dissentient Socialist deputies who took an unusual view of the war, made a speech in favour of entering into immediate peace negotiations. Amidst great excitement, he was answered by M. Briand, who in a fiery speech denounced the idea of negotiating with an enemy who stood upon the soil of France, and rejected the suggestion of a peace attained by compromise.

Rather more than a month later, at the end of October, the decision expressed by M. Briand received renewed support at a congress of the Radical-Socialist Party. The Radical-Socialists were the strongest single party in French politics, both in the Chamber of Deputies and in the Senate, and as a party of the "Left" (the Socialists were the only party further to the Left than the Radical-Socialists) their pro-war sentiments gained in importance, since in France as in all countries war enthusiasms might be expected to abate first amongst Socialists and extreme Radicals. The Radical-Socialist party possessed about 170 adherents in the Chamber of Deputies. The President of the party was M. Franklin-Bouillon in succession to M. Caillaux. The latter politician had been suspected of not being entirely in accord with the popular sentiments on the war. The resolution passed unanimously at the congress expressed "the determination of the party to persevere in the policy of the *Union Sacrée*," that is, to avoid all party polemics, and "to fight on to complete victory." The meeting rejected "as illusory, disastrous, and as placing a premium on another war, any peace which did not restore to their full rights the small nations odiously outraged, and to France the territories torn from her, and which did not furnish the guarantees indispensable for her security." It was understood that the reference to territories "torn from France" was intended to include not only the districts conquered in 1914 but also the region annexed by Germany in 1871, that is, Alsace-Lorraine. This declaration was therefore significant, because it implied that all the French parties, with the possible exception of the extreme Left (the Socialists), were prepared to make the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine a condition of peace; and there was no doubt that even some of the Socialists were of the same opinion.

During the autumn another secret session of the Chamber was held, and following upon this, in December, there was a reorganisation of the Cabinet, the number of Cabinet Ministers being reduced. M. Briand remained Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs. The other members of the reduced War Cabinet were M. Ribot (Finance Minister), General Lyautez (War Minister), Admiral Lacaye (Minister of Marine), M. Thomas (Minister of Munitions), and M. Painlevé (Minister of Inventions).

The peace proposals made by Germany in December were received in France with scepticism and derision. At a session

of the Senate on December 19, the Premier referred to these proposals in a manner which made it clear that they would be uncompromisingly rejected by France and her Allies. M. Briand, speaking with scorn, said that he deemed the proposals a sign of the increasing weakness of the enemy, but that the suggestion could not be taken seriously. The French people when they heard of the victory of Verdun, had, he said, shouted aloud, "That is the best reply."

Nevertheless, the peace offer of the German Government and the German people did not go entirely without response from France. The categorical refusal which came from the Paris Government represented the wishes of the great majority of the French people, but not of all. During the autumn a certain unrest began to manifest itself in the Socialist party, and the German peace offer caused this unrest to develop into open dissension, which threatened a definite rupture of the party. Early in the autumn a minute minority of extreme Socialists began to speak of peace by negotiation, and during December this section grew in influence with such extraordinary rapidity, that the question arose as to whether they were any longer only a minority of the party. The Socialist Party, it should be said, numbered about 100 members of the Chamber. Now after the German Note had been received, some of the Socialist Federations, notably the important Federation of the Seine, passed resolutions calling upon the Allied Governments to take all necessary steps to be informed officially of the German conditions of peace, to refuse no proposal without giving it serious consideration, and to submit such proposals to the Parliaments concerned. The resolutions further stated that in the event of the German proposals appearing unacceptable, the Entente Governments ought themselves to state precise counter-proposals explaining definitely the war-aims which they considered necessary to peace.

It will be seen that the attitude of those who framed these resolutions was very unlike that of the French Ministry. In this Socialist movement one may see the first attempt at forming a real Opposition in France. The movement did not seriously begin, however, until after the German peace proposal, and at the end of the year it was still too early to tell whether the new dissentient Socialists would become sufficiently powerful to influence the course of French history. Although the resolution referred to above was carried by various district Federations of the Socialists, the national congress of the Socialist Party, meeting on December 28, carried (though only by a very small majority) a resolution condemning the German peace proposals on the ground of their vagueness and refusing under the circumstances then existing to enter into relations even with the anti-war minority of German Socialists.

President Wilson's intervention in the discussion of the peace proposals was received unfavourably by most Frenchmen,

but the dissentient group of Socialists, which had now come into existence, were naturally delighted to see the American President making exactly the same request to the belligerent Governments which they themselves had made to the Entente Governments a few days before—namely, to state in precise language what their war-aims really were. Nevertheless, surprise and some resentment were caused in France by Mr. Wilson's statement that the declared aims of all the belligerents were virtually identical.

Before the end of the year the sum of 345,000,000*l.* was voted by Parliament for the war expenses during the first quarter of 1917.

In October a second French War Loan was issued, the first having been issued in the autumn of the previous year. The loan was to bear interest at 5 per cent., and the price at which the new Rentes were issued was 88½. Both capital and interest were to be exempt from all French taxes, both present and future. The result was announced in the Chamber by M. Ribot, the Finance Minister, on November 9, and he stated that 454,400,000*l.* had been subscribed. Of this sum, no less than 54½ per cent. was "new money." A very large proportion of the money had been raised in small subscriptions from numerous humble individuals, and M. Ribot mentioned the interesting fact that in the provinces 160,000,000 francs had been paid in gold coins. It will be seen that the funds raised by this loan covered less than half the war expenditure for the year.

II. ITALY.

In November, 1915, Italy had agreed to adhere to the Pact of London, the treaty by which Russia, France, Great Britain, and Japan had bound themselves not to make any separate peace in the Great War. Yet both in respect of the legal position of the Government and in respect of the state of public opinion, Italy's attitude towards the conflict was not quite that of the three original signatories of the pact. Italy was at war with Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria, but was not legally at war with Germany, the chief enemy of the Triple Entente. Moreover, Italy had not been a guarantor of Belgian neutrality, and a large minority of Italians had originally been opposed to any participation in the war, even a limited campaign against Austria-Hungary. When war was actually declared, however, in May, 1915, the greater number of the neutralists showed themselves prepared to accept the fact of war and to support what had become the national cause, and hence the beginning of 1916 found the large majority of Italians loyally following the great Liberal leaders, Signor Salandra and Baron Sonnino. Even so, however, the neutralists who continued to maintain their opposition formed a body of opinion much larger and more influential than the trifling anti-war minority in Great Britain. The extraordinary unanimity of opinion which prevailed in

France and Great Britain, and the only less striking unanimity in Russia, could not be paralleled in Italy. The interventionists had consisted of the Nationalists, some Conservatives, the Liberals, the Radicals, the Republicans, and the Reformist Socialists, whilst the neutralists had originally comprised a heterogeneous conglomeration of Clericals, most of the Conservatives, the Official Socialists, and the Syndicalists. The Conservatives had accepted the accomplished fact, however, and their famous leader, Signor Giolitti, had gone into retirement after the failure of his efforts to maintain peace. Thus it came about that the anti-war cause was supported only by the Official Socialists and by a few ultra-Clerical politicians representing the views of the Vatican, whose political associations were with Austria and Spain, rather than with the Italian kingdom. The parliamentary opposition was carried on exclusively by the Socialists, who mustered about 75 votes in the Lower House, the total number of deputies being 508.

In February a highly important French mission paid a visit to Rome. The mission consisted of the French Premier himself, M. Briand, and of M. Albert Thomas, the Minister of Munitions, M. Léon Bourgeois, and several other high officials. The French Ministers arrived in Rome on February 10, and were entertained at a banquet at the Consulta that evening, brief speeches emphasising the friendship of France and Italy being made by Baron Sonnino and M. Briand. The following day the two Premiers had long conversations, and M. Thomas conferred with General Zupelli, the Italian War Minister. It was announced that the object of the visit was to attain a more complete co-ordination of the efforts of the allied Powers, more particularly in the matter of the manufacture of munitions of war. Immediately after these conferences a Royal Decree was issued forbidding trade between Italy and Germany, but the latter country did not make this action a *casus belli*.

The Parliament was opened on March 1, and Signor Bissolati made a speech proposing that greetings should be sent to the French Chamber of Deputies expressing the sympathy which Italy felt with France and the unity of all the Allies. The motion was carried by acclamation, only the Official Socialists refusing to rise to support it. The meeting of Parliament revealed considerable discontent among the interventionist parties which were not represented in the Ministry, that is, all the interventionists other than the Liberals; and the Cabinet was criticised for weakness in not having declared war on Germany. The Government were also criticised for their alleged neglect of various economic problems that had been raised by the war, but on March 19 a vote of confidence was carried in the Lower House by 394 to 61. The Radical interventionists made it clear, however, through the mouth of Signor Bissolati, that it was only their sense of patriotism which made them vote for the Government in this troublous time, and that they were far from

thinking that the Ministry had acted with the necessary decision. Signor Bissolati's influence was rapidly increasing at this time and he was recognised as the leader of the Radicals, Republicans, and Reformist Socialists.

Italy, which was a poverty-stricken country even before the war, found herself in a difficult position financially at this time. The Italian debt before the war stood at 580,000,000*l.* The cost of the war was estimated at about 390,000,000*l.* up to June 30, 1916, and of this sum only 200,000,000*l.* had been covered by the war loan. Thus the Italian debt amounted even in the middle of the year to nearly one milliard sterling, a sum which would weigh very heavily upon the Italian people, and which they would probably bear with greater difficulty than the wealthier nations would find in carrying the larger debts which they were respectively accumulating. The Italian revenue for the year ending June 30, 1916, was 120,281,113*l.*, and the expenditure, excluding war charges, was 118,421,800*l.* It was expected that the revenue for the financial year 1916-17 would amount to 114,700,000*l.*

At the end of March the British Prime Minister paid an official visit to Italy. Mr. Asquith arrived in Rome on March 31, and that evening Baron Sonnino, the Foreign Minister, gave a dinner in his honour at the Foreign Office. On April 1 the British Premier had a busy day. In the morning he paid an official visit to the Pope, and in the afternoon the Mayor of Rome, Prince Colonna, gave a reception at the Capitol in his honour. Prince Colonna made a speech emphasising the sympathy which had existed between Italy and Great Britain for many years, and Mr. Asquith in his reply stated that he had come from England and from France to declare the solidarity of the Allies at that critical moment in the world's history, and said that nowhere could the high aims of the Entente be more fitly proclaimed than in the Capitol of Rome, which had been the centre and source of so many of the ideals which had guided the development of the nations of Western Europe. In the evening a dinner was given by Sir Rennell Rodd, the British Ambassador, at the Embassy, and most of the members of the Italian Cabinet were present at this function. On the following day, Sunday, April 2, Signor Salandra gave a luncheon at the Hotel Excelsior, at which courtesies and the usual historic references were again exchanged. That evening Mr. Asquith left Rome for the Italian Headquarters, where he spent April 3 and 4, being received by the King and by General Cadorna, the Commander-in-Chief.

The Austrian victories in Tyrol and northern Venetia at the end of May caused intense dissatisfaction in Italy, and led speedily to an internal political crisis. Criticism was first seriously expressed in the Lower House when the Budget was being discussed on June 8 and 9. On the former day Signor Chiesa proposed a motion calling upon the Government to make a

statement on the military situation, and although this motion was withdrawn after an appeal by Signor Salandra, who asked for patience, the feeling of the Chamber was apparent to all. The House was then asked by the Ministry to continue the debate on the Budget, more particularly the vote for the Ministry of the Interior, but no fewer than 110 members who were named to speak withdrew their names, an embarrassing form of criticism. On June 9 the estimates for the Ministry of the Interior were passed by 191 votes to 120, and those for the Colonial Office by 203 to 108, both these majorities being much below those customarily obtained by the Government since the war. On the following day, June 10, the crisis came to a head. The Prime Minister made a formal statement on the military situation which was regarded by most parties as highly unsatisfactory, since he openly confessed that with properly prepared defences the Austrian invasion could have been rendered impossible. The confession that the Italian defences were not properly prepared after twelve months of war was regarded as a damning fact. A direct vote of confidence followed, and the Government were defeated by 197 to 158. The adverse majority was composed of the most heterogeneous elements, Giolittians, Radicals, Official Socialists, Conservatives, Republicans (led by Signor Chiesa), and the influential Interventionist Socialists, led by the now famous Signor Bissolati. About 100 deputies abstained from voting. On June 12, Signor Salandra announced the resignation of his Cabinet. The leader of the Radicals, Signor Alassio, formally demanded that a new Government should be constituted, consisting of a coalition of all the pro-war parties. The Liberal Party in the country were naturally furious at the fall of what they regarded as one of the greatest Governments that Italy had ever had, and they pointed out that the various parties which by their combination had brought about the crisis were utterly opposed to one another on the issues of the war.

The King returned to Rome immediately after the crisis arose, and conferred with all the leading personages, more particularly with Signor Paolo Boselli, a veteran statesman of the Lower House. It soon became evident that influential circles were in favour of a Coalition Government, and it was at once regarded as probable that Signor Boselli would be the new Premier. In spite of his age—he was seventy-eight—it was known that he would be more likely than most men to be able to hold together the heterogeneous Ministry, and within a few days the King asked him to form a Government. Ultimately the new Cabinet was constituted as follows :—

Prime Minister—Signor Boselli.

Foreign Minister—Baron Sonnino.

Commissioner for War Services—Signor Bissolati.

Minister of the Interior—Signor Orlando.

Minister of War—General Morrone.

Minister of the Treasury—Signor Carcano.

Minister of Marine—Admiral Corsi.

Minister for Education—Signor Ruffini.

Minister for Colonies—Signor Colosino.

Minister of Agriculture—Signor Raimeri.

Minister of Posts—Signor Fera.

And to this list must be added half a dozen other Ministers holding appointments of lesser importance. The fact that Baron Sonnino remained at the Foreign Office was considered highly satisfactory by the Powers of the Triple Entente. The strongest personalities in this Government were the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, Signor Bissolati, and Signor Orlando, and the new Ministry had a more anti-German character than that which it succeeded, especially having regard to the presence of Signor Bissolati, who had himself been on active service and whose warlike sentiments would not have been out of place in a Minister of France, a country that he greatly admired. One of the minor posts was filled by Signor Meda, a moderate Clerical, and this was considered an event of much significance, because since 1870 no Clerical had previously entered an Italian Government. How far Signor Meda truly represented the attitude of the Vatican was, however, another question. The Official Socialists were, of course, totally unrepresented in the new Ministry, and they maintained their avowed opposition to the war; but all the other parties had one or more representatives in the Government. It must be noted, however, that none of the really prominent Conservatives were included, Signor Giolitti and his chief lieutenants maintaining their attitude of cold acquiescence in the course of events. Signor Boselli himself was a moderate Liberal.

The new Cabinet thus formed proved to be a strong Administration and remained in power for the rest of the year. It fulfilled its promise of prosecuting the war in a more vigorous manner, and before many weeks had passed the new Government brought Italy into line with her Allies by declaring war on Germany. The relations with Germany became more strained immediately after the Cabinet took office. In the middle of July the German Government decided to take the serious step of treating the Italians in Germany as "enemy aliens," a move which involved Italians resident in that country in serious commercial loss. This did not lead to an immediate declaration of war, the Italian Government preferring to make their action coincide with Rumania's declaration against Austria-Hungary. On August 27, however, the Italian Government declared war upon Germany through the medium of the Swiss Government, the declaration to be considered as taking effect as from August 28. In an explanatory memorandum published at the same time the Government stated that Germany had given Italy many occasions for a declaration of war, by assisting Austria-Hungary with arms and munitions, by allowing numerous German officers and soldiers to serve in the Austrian armies against Italy, by treating Italian subjects as enemy aliens, and in other ways.

So far as could be judged from the Press the majority of the

people welcomed this extension of the war, nearly all the papers acclaiming the action of the Government. The only exceptions were the organs of the Official Socialist Party and a few of the Conservative journals, whose comments were heavily censored, and were therefore no doubt unfavourable to the new move.

The remainder of the year was singularly uneventful. The chief anxiety of thoughtful Italians was their country's very serious financial situation.

At the time of the German peace-move in December the Italian Government acted in close accord with the other Entente countries, and in rejecting the German offer the Cabinet appeared to possess the solid support of that large majority of the Italian nation who had throughout favoured all the war measures.

CHAPTER II.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

I. GERMANY.

GREAT though the strength of the German nation was, that strength was severely strained after seventeen months of the European War. The German Army, whose total strength cannot have exceeded eight millions of men in 1914, had suffered nearly three million casualties, and of these the soldiers killed numbered almost eight hundred thousand. Loss of life on this terrible scale was a serious matter, even for such a powerful and populous country as Germany. And the financial losses were also very great. By the end of 1915 the Reichstag had sanctioned the expenditure of two milliard sterling upon war purposes, nearly the whole of which had to be met by loans; and this added to the pre-war debt of the empire, 240,000,000*l.*, brought the German federal debt up to the huge sum of 2,240,000,000*l.* Nor can this be said to have been the total indebtedness of the German nation, for the debts of the individual states, so recently federated, must be added. The state debt of the Prussian kingdom alone amounted to nearly 500,000,000*l.*, and the liabilities of the minor states were estimated at approximately 300,000,000*l.*, so that the financial burden of the German people was, even after only seventeen months of the war had passed, over three milliard sterling. Furthermore, the war had greatly reduced the standard of living. The blockade of the German coasts by the British fleet had failed to cause starvation, and had produced no serious scarcity of the materials essential for the manufacture of munitions, but it had caused a very disagreeable insufficiency of certain kinds of food. In particular, the supply of meat had become very inadequate, and butter was extremely scarce. These trials, the horrible

loss of life, the waste of wealth, the arduous, unpleasant, and unfruitful labour, had produced in the German people a deep yearning for peace. But the sufferings were not insupportable, and were not such as to cause either the Government, or the Parliament, or the German nation to consider for an instant the possibility of unconditional surrender to the country's enemies.

Early in the year a change was made in the federal constitution which, though of very little practical importance, involved an important principle and was of interest to students of constitutional law. During the forty-five years of the existence of the new German Empire, the question of the closer unification of the federated states had often been discussed. The existence of subordinate parliaments was not to be regarded, of course, as in itself a sign of political backwardness; indeed, rather the contrary. The centralised form of government happened to be the universal development among the nations of Western and Northern Europe, but the federal organisation was not only established over nearly the whole of Central Europe, in Austria, Croatia, and Switzerland, as well as Germany, but was also, of course, the principle adopted in the advanced overseas democracies, in the United States, Canada, and Australia. In Germany, however, local autonomy had mediæval aspects. The twenty-one vassal kinglings of Germany constituted a curious relic of feudalism that was absolutely unique in the civilised world. Moreover, the individual states preserved exceptionally great powers. The functions of the Bavarian Parliament were wider in scope than those of the Bohemian Diet. Again, each of the Austrian provinces was a single area of considerable extent, whereas many of the German states were almost ludicrously minute, and most of them consisted not of a single territory respectively, but of fragments geographically disunited, whose political union had come about only through the accidents of the family history and inheritance of the nobles who had acquired the dignity of petty sovereigns. This geographical separation caused some awkwardness in administration, and the aggregate area of the seven German "principalities" was only 2,300 square miles—less than that of Devonshire. Yet, since the great changes of 1866 and 1871 no further steps towards the union of the states had been taken. In 1909, however, Prince Karl Günther of Schwarzburg-Sondershausen died, and the crown was then inherited by his cousin, Prince Günther of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, the head of the younger branch of the same royal family. For seven years the principalities were linked together only by the personal bond, but in February, 1916, a joint convention of the diets of the two states was held at Erfurt, and it was agreed that the principalities should be amalgamated into one state, the speakers pointing out that this action would be a sign of the union of hearts prevailing between all Germans at this time. The two

states thus agreed between themselves, but the arrangements between the two local diets and the imperial authorities were postponed, apparently until the time of the post-war settlement. The united states, which are situated in central Germany, close to the northern border of Bavaria, consisted even after their amalgamation of three disconnected territories.

The proceedings and debates in the Reichstag in the early part of the year were of the greatest importance, and owing to the fact that the problems raised by the war were discussed in the German Parliament in more definite terms, if not with greater freedom, than in any other legislature in Europe, these debates are of much historical interest. The proceedings in the House during March were mainly concerned with finance. A new war loan, the fourth asked for by the German Government, was open for subscriptions from March 4 to March 24. The loan was issued in the form of a five per cent. State loan redeemable in $8\frac{1}{2}$ years and in the shape of four-and-a-half per cent. Treasury Bonds which it was proposed to pay off gradually between 1923 and 1932. The price of the State loan was $98\frac{1}{2}$ and that of the Treasury Bonds 95. The latter were to be redeemable at par. The financial projects followed closely the lines of those announced twelve months earlier (see A.R., 1915, p. 213), but the Government now proposed some serious measures of extra war-taxation. On March 16, Dr. Helfferich, the Minister of Finance, made a long speech on the Federal Budget of 1916-17. New taxes were to be imposed, and it was calculated that these would produce 24,000,000*l.* in the next financial year, and more in a whole year. (The taxes in question did not come into force until some time after April 1.) These war-taxes took the form of increased taxes on tobacco and increased duties on telegraphs, telephones, and letters, and stamp duties on railway and shipping freights. War profits were also to be taxed. The ordinary Budget for 1916-17 was expected to balance at 182,963,000*l.*, considerably the highest figure ever reached, and in addition to this there was an estimated Extraordinary Expenditure of 5,000,000*l.*, apart from the direct expenditure on the war. No provision was made for the payment of interest on the war credit out of revenue. Dr. Helfferich stated that the war credit voted by the House in December would still be sufficient for several months, and he then went on to compare the financial condition of the several belligerent countries. The Minister said that the financial position of Germany was much superior to that of any other belligerent, except perhaps Great Britain, and in some respects compared favourably even with Great Britain. Germany had covered her war expenditure by long-term loans, whereas Great Britain had relied to a great extent on short-term loans, which, he said, now amounted to 750,000,000*l.* Great Britain's monthly war expenditure was 150,000,000*l.*, whereas that of Germany was about 100,000,000*l.* France and Russia were

each spending nearly as much as Germany, whereas Austria-Hungary was spending only 65,000,000*l.* per month. Including the Italian expenditure (30,000,000*l.* per month), the total war expenditure of the Quadruple Entente was 12,000,000*l.* per day (360,000,000*l.* per month), whilst that of the Central Powers was only 5,500,000*l.* per day (165,000,000*l.* per month). This fact was, said the Minister, of good augury for Germany and her Allies. He calculated that the total expenditure of the enemy countries up to March 31, 1916, was 5,000,000,000*l.* to 5,250,000,000*l.* and that that of Germany and her Allies was 2,500,000,000*l.* to 2,625,000,000*l.*, the respective expenditures thus being in the ratio of 2 to 1. Dr. Helfferich also claimed that the deposits in German Savings Banks had increased since the beginning of the war by 25,000,000*l.*

It was announced a few days later that the subscriptions to the Fourth War Loan had reached a total of 533,000,000*l.* Thus the four loans together had produced the sum of 1,815,000,000*l.*, as against credits up to 2,000,000,000*l.* voted by the Reichstag, and an expenditure actually incurred of about 1,700,000,000*l.*

At the end of 1915 and in January and February, 1916, the German people were much disturbed by the so-called *Baralong* incident, and great indignation was expressed all over the country. The German Government alleged, on the strength of certain American witnesses, that on August 19, 1915, the British auxiliary cruiser *Baralong* had fired on and murdered the helpless and drowning crew of a German submarine, which had been disabled by the cruiser and was sinking. The German Government demanded that those responsible for this alleged crime should be tried by a British naval court-martial. The British Government refused this demand, but offered to submit the case to an American naval tribunal, if the German Government would allow the same tribunal to investigate three cases of alleged atrocities by German submarines. The German Government replied on January 10, refusing to agree to this proposal, and stating that the cases in question had already been investigated by the German naval authorities, and that it was only asked that British naval officers should investigate the *Baralong* incident, as it was not doubted that a British naval tribunal would mete out suitable punishment to the offenders. The British Government sent another reply on February 25, but no agreement of any sort was reached. The *Baralong* incident was debated in the Reichstag in January, when all parties, including the anti-war Socialists, expressed their indignation with the British Government.

The spring session of the Prussian Parliament was of considerable interest. The diet was opened on January 13, and on that day a long speech from the Throne was read, not by the King himself, but by Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg, who, it will be remembered, was not only Imperial Chancellor, but also held the position of Prussian Prime Minister. The royal message

began by eulogising the army and nation for the manner in which they had withstood a world of enemies, and proceeded to refer to the proposals for new taxation. Additional income-taxes would be necessary, and state-funds would be used for the restoration of the devastated province of East Prussia. Then followed a vague reference to the question of franchise reform. The mutual sympathy and understanding which had arisen during the war would, it was declared, continue in time of peace; and this spirit would permeate all the national activities, and would find expression "in shaping the principles for the representation of the people in legislative bodies." Prussia, the King declared, had grown great in storm, and in storm stood to-day unshakable.

The passage in the King's speech which excited most interest in Germany was that referring to franchise reform. The vagueness of the phrases used caused much disappointment and dissatisfaction among members of the Central (Catholic), Radical, and Socialist parties. The notorious three-classes system of franchise for the Lower House of the Prussian Parliament had for many years been one of the chief grievances of the democratic parties in that state, and it was hoped that the loyalty shown by Radicals and Socialists during the war would lead to the desired reforms. Although this question was primarily only a problem of Prussian internal politics, the fact that the Prussian Constitution was utterly undemocratic was indirectly a matter of some importance to all Germany, and indeed to all Europe. The Prussian Diet, as such, was of course entirely subordinate to the Imperial Parliament, but since the Prussian Government had the right to nominate seventeen members of the Bundesrat, the Upper House of the German Parliament, that Government had the power to wield considerable influence in Imperial and Foreign affairs. Thus the policy of the Bundesrat was largely affected not by the views of the Prussian people as a whole, but by the opinions of the upper classes in Prussia, who were nearly always Conservative, and often highly reactionary.

A Constitutional point of some interest was raised during March. At that time the submarine question was becoming of great importance, owing to the fact that the United States Government were insisting upon a modification of Germany's policy, and the German Chancellor was notoriously desirous of acceding to the American demands. The Prussian Diet, which unlike the Reichstag was dominated by the chauvinistic parties, therefore sent a memorandum to the Chancellor urging that the American requests should be refused, and an unmitigated submarine war waged against Great Britain. The Chancellor replied that the Prussian Parliament had no status in the discussion of foreign policy, and the Foreign Minister, Herr von Jagow, protested at what he regarded as an unconstitutional attempt at interference. The Prussian Diet refused, however, to admit this limitation, and on the technical point thus raised the Diet's

opinion was supported by a note from the Saxon Government. The German Government considered that the influence of the states on foreign policy should be exerted only through the Bundesrat, and as described elsewhere, the Imperial authorities paid no attention to the Prussian Diet's views, but ultimately adopted, with the concurrence of the Reichstag, the moderate policy on the submarine issue which was favoured by Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg.

The Prussian Budget for 1916-17 was passed through the Parliament in March, the only active opposition coming from the Socialists, although the Polish and Danish Nationalists abstained when the estimates were finally voted in the Lower House. The estimated revenue for the year was 240,522,000*l.* and the estimated expenditure was 240,497,000*l.* These figures were almost the same as those for the previous year. The House of Lords adopted the Budget without discussion, but passed a resolution affirming its right to discuss foreign policy.

During the early spring the question of how to employ submarines was very much to the front in Germany. One party, led by Admiral von Tirpitz, the Minister of Marine, and consisting mainly of Conservatives and National Liberals, were in favour of carrying on the submarine war against Great Britain with the utmost ruthlessness, without regard for the lives of non-combatant subjects of the enemy states, and even without respect for the interests and safety of neutrals. It was argued that since Great Britain (as was alleged) had broken the code of International Law by her illegal blockade, it was not necessary for Germany to adhere to the conventions of maritime warfare. The other party were prepared to pay some respect to neutral rights, and even to safeguard to some extent the lives of non-combatant seamen and passengers on British ships. There had long been this sharp difference of opinion in the Government. The moderates were led by Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg, and were supported by Herr von Jagow, who was an able man, not addicted to extreme views, and was very desirous of avoiding complications with America. It transpired that the Chancellor's policy was approved by the Emperor, and on March 15 it was announced that Grand-Admiral von Tirpitz had retired from the Ministry. The resignation caused a great sensation, as the Admiral was one of the best known men in Germany. He was succeeded by Admiral von Capelle, who was believed to be a man of much less pronounced personality. Von Tirpitz retired with all honours, and was presented with a decoration by the Emperor.

The differences of opinion between the Chancellor and the extreme chauvinists manifested themselves in other directions besides that of the submarine question, and Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg came to rely more and more upon the support of the Catholic and Radical parties, rather than upon the Liberals and Conservatives. On April 5 the Chancellor made a long speech

in the Reichstag, covering a wide field of politics, and his pronouncements on this occasion were clearly intended to supplement those he had made on August 19 and December 9, 1915. (See A.R., 1915, pp. 223, 224, and 226.)

The speech commenced by reciting the recent military failures of the Entente, at the Dardanelles, in Serbia, in Montenegro and Albania, and on the Tigris. The Chancellor then stated that he was surprised that after the experience of the last twelve months, the enemy still fancied that it was possible to starve out Germany. The next harvest would prove much better than that of 1915, which had been the worst for many years. The speaker declared once again that the British attempt to starve out Germany was contrary to international law, and therefore justified the German submarine war. After a brief reference to the declaration of war against Portugal, the Chancellor proceeded to discuss at length the German war-aims and possible terms of peace. He said that on December 9 he had declared his readiness to discuss peace terms, but no similar readiness was to be observed amongst enemy statesmen. For Mr. Asquith the complete and final destruction of the military power of Prussia remained the preliminary condition of all peace negotiations. At the same time Mr. Asquith complained that he (the Chancellor) did not make offers of peace. "Now imagine the case if I proposed to Mr. Asquith to sit down with me at a table to examine the possibilities of peace, and Mr. Asquith began with his final and complete destruction of the military power of Prussia. The conversation would be at an end before it had begun. To such a condition of peace there remains to us only one answer, and this answer is given by our sword. If our enemies desire the murder of men and the desolation of Europe to go on, theirs is the blame. We stand firm, and our arm will be outstretched for ever more powerful blows." The German aim on the other hand was not directed against the ruin of any foreign nation, but merely at the establishment of Germany in a position of security from another general attack. Germans had desired only the peaceful development of Europe, but their enemies chose war. (At this point Herr Liebknecht shouted, "It was you who chose war," and much uproar followed.) The Chancellor proceeded to refer to the Polish question. The Central Empires had not desired to reopen this, but the course of events had opened it, and there could be no return to the *status quo ante*. Germany and Austria-Hungary would solve the Polish question. After the war there would be a new Poland. Mr. Asquith had spoken of the principle of nationalities. Did he really imagine that Germany would ever again voluntarily surrender to the domination of reactionary Russia the peoples that had been liberated by Germany and Austria-Hungary between the Baltic Sea and the Volhynian swamps, whether they be Poles or Lithuanians, Letts or Balts? Russia would not again possess that territory. Con-

tinuing, the Chancellor said that the Germans would only evacuate Belgium if they had adequate guarantees that the country would not be turned into an Anglo-French vassal state, and his expressed willingness to evacuate Belgium was made the more ambiguous by the statement that the Germans would not give over again to the process of Latinisation "the long-oppressed Flemish race." The Europe which would arise out of this war would be an impoverished Europe, and it was essential that the coming peace should be a lasting peace. He hoped to see that the terms would not contain the seeds of new wars, but would contain at last the seeds of a peaceable regulation of European affairs.

This important speech was followed by a long debate lasting two days. One of the notable points in the debate was the policy of establishing, or rather of retaining after the war, some kind of control over Belgium. This policy was supported not only by the Conservatives and National Liberals, who had long approved of the idea, but also by Dr. Spahn, the leader of the Centre party. An important speech was delivered by Herr Haase, the leader of the Socialist minority, who since the Russians had been driven back twelve months earlier had consistently opposed the continuance of the war. He said that his party were entirely opposed to a new partition of Poland, though they would be delighted to see Poland given her independence. As for the Letts and Balts, these people ought, he said, to be allowed to decide their own fate. The Lett party appeared to side with Russia rather than with Germany. Let Germany, in view of the terrible experience of Alsace-Lorraine, the seizure of which had made France a chronic enemy, beware of these schemes of annexation. The Chancellor's remarks about Belgium deserved, he said, the strongest condemnation. Belgium ought to have real independence, and should be neither a vassal of France and England nor a vassal of Germany. The Flemings no doubt possessed their own culture, but it would be a grave mistake to attempt to separate the Flemings and the Walloons, who ought to remain united as one nation. He demanded that Germany should restore Belgium, and repair the wrong that she had done. Only such action would bring peace near.

Herr von Jagow, the Foreign Minister, then replied to Herr Haase. He said that the Chancellor's original statement at the beginning of the war that every compensation should be given to Belgium for the wrong done her, must now be regarded in a new light because it was now proved that Belgium had not done her duty as a truly neutral state, but had secretly agreed before the war to join the Entente in the event of a conflict. Herr Scheidemann, one of the leaders of the pro-war Socialists, said that great credit was due to the German Government for having declared in December, 1915, that Germany was prepared to consider peace proposals, and the whole civilised world would rejoice if Poland were liberated from Russia's tyranny. If in

the peace treaty Germany secured greater opportunities of development for Flemish culture, that could not be described as an act of violation.

The debate then closed with shorter speeches, Herr Liebknecht, the independent extremist, being unable to obtain a hearing.

The interminable discussion about the origins of the war continued, in one form and another, throughout the year. Thus in May the Chancellor once more published the German case, this time through the medium of an American journalist, Mr. Karl von Wiegand, who was a correspondent of the *New York World*. The chief point that it was sought to emphasise in this statement, as in most pleas for Germany, was that the Russian mobilisation in July, 1914, was the immediate cause of Europe being precipitated into the catastrophe. It was pointed out that the Central Powers were quite willing at the end of July to continue to negotiate about the differences which had arisen, provided that the continuance of the negotiations did not alter the military situation to their detriment. It was stated that the well-known strategic plan of the Central Powers in the event of a general European war was to throw the bulk of their forces against France, and endeavour to overwhelm her whilst the slow Russian mobilisation was being completed. The Central Powers were willing to continue to negotiate if none of the Powers mobilised during the negotiations. If, however, the negotiations lasted several weeks, and both sides were permitted to mobilise fully during that period and then the negotiations broke down after all, it was clear that the military situation would have been altered greatly to the disadvantage of the Central Powers, since the advantage which they originally possessed through the slowness of Russia's mobilisation would have been lost to them. Hence it was contended that the Russian Government's obstinate refusal to counter-order their mobilisation during the period of negotiations was the immediate cause of the war, because this refusal made it impossible for the Central Powers to continue to negotiate without giving away the advantage upon which, in the event of the negotiations failing, their hopes would be mainly based. This was the chief point in the Chancellor's communication to Mr. Karl von Wiegand, though he also touched upon many others.

The crisis in the relations between Germany and the United States which occurred in April is described elsewhere (see United States). On the German side the preservation of peace was determined by the result of a struggle between the chauvinistic party and the moderates. The Conservatives and National Liberals were crying out for a ruthless and reckless submarine war, since they considered that the disadvantages which would arise for Germany if America declared war would be more than counter-balanced by the results of a submarine campaign waged

without any regard for the feelings of neutrals or the dictates of international law. The moderates, that is, the Catholics, Radicals, and pro-war Socialists, held, on the other hand, that it would be ruinous to quarrel with America, and that no practicable increase of submarine activity could compensate for such a catastrophe to Germany. Moreover, some of the moderates, especially among the Socialists, had some regard for common humanity and the abstract principles of international law. The Chancellor was known to favour the opinions of the moderates, and hence the chauvinists tried to drive him from office, but he had the support of the Emperor, and consequently, as mentioned elsewhere, the threatened rupture between the two great countries did not take place.

During May some important changes took place in the personnel of the German Government. Dr. Delbrück, Minister of the Interior, resigned his appointment, and was succeeded by Dr. Helfferich, who had been Finance Minister up till this time. Dr. Helfferich had greatly enhanced his reputation by his activities as Finance Minister; he was regarded as the Chancellor's right-hand man, and was undoubtedly one of the half-dozen most influential statesmen in Central Europe. A certain Count von Roedern, a less able man, became Secretary of Finance. A new post was also created at the same time. A Ministry of Food Supplies was instituted, owing to the difficulties caused by the British naval blockade, and the official appointed to control this new department, who was generally known as the "Food Dictator," was Herr von Batocki, who had previously been President of the province of East Prussia, one of the most important agrarian districts in Germany.

Early in 1916 the Prussian Government issued the vital statistics of that kingdom relating to the year 1914. These statistics were of great importance and interest, since the figures, especially those representing the death-rate, necessarily reflected the upheaval in life caused by the war. The number of deaths gives us an almost exact clue to the number of Prussians killed in action in the first five months of the war, since the number of deaths in 1913 is known, and the normal excess of deaths in 1914 as compared with 1913 (due to the steady increase of population) may be taken to be very small. As the war had not brought either famine or disease to the civil population to any considerable extent, no great increase in the number of deaths among civilians occurred. The total number of deaths in Prussia in 1914 was recorded as 802,776, that is approximately 146,000 more than in 1913. Now the population of Prussia being slightly over four-sevenths of that of the entire German Empire, if it be assumed that the deaths proportionately increased among the non-Prussian population, then in all Germany the excess of deaths in 1914 as compared with 1913 must have been approximately 250,000. Thus one may arrive at the conclusion that during the first five months of the war

the average number of soldiers killed per month was not far short of 50,000. The reader will notice that this figure is congruous with the statistics of casualties given elsewhere (see *History of the War*, Chap. I.) ; although it would thus appear, as might, however, be expected from the nature of the military operations, that the rate of German losses was higher during the first five months than during the subsequent thirteen months. The number of births in Prussia in 1914 was 1,202,528 and the number of marriages was 286,197, both these totals being slightly below the corresponding figures for 1913.

During September and October, immediately after the intervention of Rumania in the war, the attention of the German public was once more largely concentrated upon questions of national finance. At the beginning of September it became necessary for the Ministry to issue a Fifth War Loan, and indeed the loan was already overdue. The Government made urgent appeals to the public to subscribe, and issued strongly worded warnings as to the fate which would befall the country if the civil population failed to support the army with the funds needful for the prosecution of the war. The new loan, which was open for subscriptions throughout September, was issued at 98 and bore interest at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The result was announced by Count von Roedern in the Reichstag on October 7, and from the figures given it appeared that over 530,000,000*l.* had been subscribed. The Emperor sent a message of congratulation to the Finance Minister, and the authorities declared that the result was a great "victory" for Germany, but although the amount subscribed was no doubt remarkable, it by no means covered the unhappy country's commitments. The five war loans had produced approximately 2,350,000,000*l.*, the respective totals of the fourth and fifth loans being almost identical. Now in addition to the war credits already mentioned, Parliament had voted another 600,000,000*l.* during the summer, so that the five loans had failed to cover the war credits to date, since these now reached the total of 2,600,000,000*l.* Further, even these credits only covered the war expenditure for the first nine or ten months of the year, and in October the Government were obliged to ask the Reichstag for another vote of 600,000,000*l.* This latter vote would, however, cover the war expenditure for at least the first three months of 1917. The position was thus an extremely serious one, for the total indebtedness of Germany, including both federal and state debts, now amounted to over four milliard sterling. Parliament passed the new credits, the only opposition coming from the anti-war minority of the Socialist party.

A session of the Reichstag was opened on September 28, and this, as already indicated, was mainly concerned with finance, but on the opening day the Imperial Chancellor took the opportunity to refer to recent developments in the international situation, more particularly the intervention of Rumania and

the open war which had now broken out between Italy and Germany. In regard to Italy, the Chancellor pointed out that a *de facto* state of war had existed since Italy attacked Austria-Hungary, and that having regard to the pressure put upon Italy by Great Britain and the collision between Italian and German troops in Macedonia, it was only to be expected that a formal declaration of war would ultimately be made. Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg then went on to relate the story of the relations of Rumania with the two Central Empires. The late King Carol had, he said, desired to join the Central Powers immediately after war broke out, as he considered that this was incumbent upon Rumania owing to her treaty relations with the Triple Alliance, but the Government opposed the sovereign's wishes, and secretly sympathised with the Entente. The territorial ambitions of Russia and Rumania had clashed, declared the speaker, and thus no agreement had been reached between Rumania and the Entente in 1915, but nevertheless Rumanian neutrality became more and more beneficent towards Germany's enemies. The Rumanian Government, said the Chancellor, had always had their eye on the military situation, and had been waiting to see the course of the war in order that they might choose the moment to intervene at which the risk to themselves would be at a minimum. The Chancellor said that he had repeatedly been assured by the Rumanian Government that Rumania would remain neutral in all circumstances. Both the King and the Premier, even up to the very day before the declaration of war, had declared to the representatives of the Central Powers in Bukarest that the Rumanian Government did not desire war. The Chancellor, possibly failing to remember his own statements about Belgian neutrality, here sneered at "political conditions in which royal words and ministerial words have no value."

The next passages of the speech referred to the strategic situation, which the Chancellor said was very satisfactory for Germany, especially in the Balkans, where the scheme of a joint Entente offensive from the Dobrudja and from Salonika with the object of severing the communications between Germany and Turkey, had already definitely failed. Referring next to the politics of the war, the speaker said that the Entente were avowedly fighting for territorial conquests—Constantinople for the Russians, Alsace-Lorraine for France, the Trentino for the Italians, Transylvania for the Rumanians. Since the first day, however, the war had been for the Germans nothing but the defence of their right to national existence and freedom. After referring to recent statements of the French Premier, von Bethmann-Hollweg dealt with British aims: "What England will seize from the hoped-for booty in Asia Minor and in the colonies she still leaves in the dark. But she wants more than that. What the British wish to make of Germany—about this they leave no doubt. Our existence as a nation is to be crushed.

Militarily defenceless, economically crushed and boycotted by the world, condemned to lasting sickness—that is the Germany which England wants to see at her feet. Then, when there is no German competition to be feared, when France has been bled to death, when all the Allies are, financially and economically, doing slave-work for England, when the neutral European world must submit to every British order, every British blacklist, then upon an impotent Germany the dream of British world supremacy is to become a reality. Great Britain is fighting for this object with an expenditure of strength without example in her history and with methods which break one international law after another. Great Britain is of all the most egoistic and fiercest, the most obstinate enemy. The German statesman who would hesitate to use against this enemy every available instrument of battle that will really shorten the war—such a statesman should be hanged.” (Loud cheers.) This outburst of the Chancellor had reference to the complaints of the chauvinists that he was unduly scrupulous in his methods of waging the submarine war. After an appeal for the war loan, the speech closed with an eloquent passage dealing with the great work of reconstruction which would await all Germans after the conclusion of peace.

During the autumn the problem of food supplies became more serious than formerly. The shortage of meat was so great that the Food Dictator only allowed each adult of the population $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. per week, and children received less. The potato crop had been very poor, which was a great disappointment, because potatoes had previously been the mainstay of the poorer classes. Thus although the harvest, in respect of cereals, had been superior to that of 1915, the position was on the whole considerably worse than it had been in the previous winter. The supplies secured by the conquest of Rumania were not large, as the Rumanians in their retreat had destroyed great stocks of grain. Indeed, the victories in Rumania could not seriously affect the problem until after the harvest of 1917, when, if the Central Powers still occupied the country, the scarcity would undoubtedly be reduced by the produce of that wonderfully fertile land. Thus the difficulty the Germans had to face was that of eking out their supplies until the harvest of 1917.

It has been already stated that a minority of the Socialist party in Parliament had since the middle of 1915 adopted a definitely anti-war position. What the strength of the different parties may have been at this time in the electorate it is impossible to say; but it is clear that during 1916 an extreme Socialist, and even revolutionary movement had been gathering power amongst the people, although of course its manifestations were mainly surreptitious. The anti-war movement, whatever may have been its actual dimensions, led to an extraordinary growth of police tyranny and to the institution of a system of what was called “preventive arrest.” Anybody who was suspected of

holding revolutionary opinions or of taking the smallest part in any extreme pacifist agitation was liable to be suddenly arrested in order to "prevent" further "mischievous" propaganda by the unfortunate person concerned. The police established a veritable reign of terror, comparable only to that which has so often been witnessed in Russia under reactionary Ministers of the Interior. This system of preventive arrest was at work all over Germany except in the kingdom of Bavaria, which, it will be remembered, was largely independent of the King of Prussia, even in war-time. In Bavaria the system was unknown. The scandal was not allowed to continue, however, without a protest from the Reichstag. An extraordinary scene was witnessed in the assembly on October 28. A determined speech was made against the principle of preventive arrest by Herr Dittmann, a Socialist. He was supported not only by Radicals, but even by the National Liberal speakers, Herren Riesser and Paasche. Dr. Helfferich, now Minister of the Interior, endeavoured to reply to the charges, but the House was hostile and determined, and eventually the Government accepted a National Liberal motion on the subject. After this action of the Reichstag, the evil, if not abolished, was very much reduced, and the episode was notable as a successful assertion by the Reichstag of its power over the Administration.

During the autumn there were various changes in the German Government, of which the most important was the resignation of Herr von Jagow, the Foreign Minister. He was succeeded by Herr Zimmermann, hitherto Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

On November 9 the Chancellor made another long speech in the Reichstag dealing with the negotiations which immediately preceded the war. The speech was mainly a reply to a recent statement to the Foreign Press Association made by Viscount Grey. The Chancellor again stated that "the act which made war inevitable was the Russian general mobilisation which was ordered on the night of July 30-31, 1914." Viscount Grey had now tried to explain this Russian mobilisation by stating that a false report of a general German mobilisation had appeared in the *Lokalanzeiger* on July 30, but the edition of the paper containing this report had been immediately suppressed by the Government, and the Russian Ambassador and all the other Ambassadors had been informed by telephone that the report was false. The Russian Ambassador had telegraphed to Petrograd reporting the *Lokalanzeiger's* statement, but a few minutes later he had sent a second telegram contradicting the news contained in the first. The two telegrams must have reached Petrograd almost simultaneously, and in any case the Russian mobilisation was not ordered until after the second telegram (and also a third confirming the second) had been received. For more than two years the Russian Government had never once alleged that their mobilisation had been

caused by the *Lokalanzeiger's* report. The excuse, said the Chancellor, had been invented by Viscount Grey more than two years after the event.

The speech, as already stated, was very long, and it covered once more almost the whole of the German case in respect of the ill-fated negotiations. Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg revealed, however, one new diplomatic fact, which may have possessed some importance. He said that he had retransmitted to Vienna with a most peremptory recommendation the mediation proposal made to the German ambassador in London on July 29, and which appeared to him (the Chancellor) a suitable basis for the maintenance of peace. The Chancellor said his telegram to Vienna on this subject was worded as follows: "Should the Austro-Hungarian Government refuse all mediation, we are confronted with a conflagration in which England would go against us, and Italy and Rumania, according to all indications, would not be with us, so that with Austria-Hungary we should confront three Great Powers. Germany, as a result of England's hostility, would have to bear the chief brunt of the fight. The political prestige of Austria-Hungary, the honour of her arms, and her just claims against Serbia can be sufficiently safeguarded by the occupation of Belgrade or other places. We, therefore, urgently and emphatically ask the Vienna Cabinet to consider the acceptance of mediation on the proposed conditions. Responsibility for the consequences which may otherwise arise must be extraordinarily severe for Austria-Hungary and ourselves." This proposal, continued the speaker, had been accepted by Vienna on condition that Russia counter-ordered her mobilisation. These were the most important points in Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg's speech.

As described elsewhere (see *The European War*), after the Rumanian declaration of war the Emperor removed General von Falkenhayn from the position of Chief of the General Staff and appointed the famous Marshal von Hindenburg to that position. On the advice of the great military leader, the Government decided that even more strenuous efforts than those already made ought to be put forth in order to support the field-army with the immense supplies of munitions that were required for a successful defence of the enormously extended German lines. With this object in view the Government introduced in the Reichstag at the end of November a remarkable Bill to confer upon the State power to mobilise labour compulsorily for war-work. The Bill was called the "Patriotic Auxiliary Service" Bill. It consisted of four clauses which may be quoted here verbatim:—

(1) Every male German from the completion of his seventeenth to the completion of his sixtieth year is, in so far as he has not been summoned to service with the armed forces, liable to patriotic auxiliary service during the period of the war.

(2) Patriotic Auxiliary Service consists, apart from service in Government offices and official institutions, in particular in service in war industry, in agriculture, in the nursing of the sick, and in organisation of every kind of an economic character connected with the war, as well as in other undertakings which are immediately or indirectly of importance for purposes of the conduct of the war or the provision of the requirements of the people. The control of the Patriotic Auxiliary Service is vested in the War Office established in the Prussian Ministry of War.

(3) The Bundesrat issues the provisions required for the carrying out of the law. The Bundesrat can make contraventions of the law punishable by imprisonment for not more than one year and by fines to the amount of not more than 500*ℳ.*, or by one of these penalties or by arrest.

(4) The law comes into force on the day of its proclamation. The Bundesrat decides the date at which it ceases to be in force.

A memorandum was attached to the Bill explaining how its provisions were to be put into practice. It appeared that the Bill was to be administered separately in Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, and Wurtemberg, the Prussian administration having control not only of Prussia itself but also of the twenty-one minor states. Recruiting committees were to be established in each recruiting area, and as a rule the first call issued by such a committee would be for volunteer war-workers. In the event of sufficient volunteers not being obtained within the area, workers were to be conscribed, though the individuals so affected were to have the right to appeal to a higher authority against the decision of the committee concerned. The memorandum also laid down that respect was to be paid by the committees to "the age, family circumstances, place of residence, health, and previous occupation of the man liable for service," and in respect to the exclusion of women from the scope of the Bill, it was stated that "it seems possible to do without the establishment of a similar compulsion for women, because it is considered that it will be possible without a special stimulus to provide in abundant measure the labour of German women, which has proved itself so creditably during the war." The memorandum also stated that in the administration of the new Act no respect whatever would be paid to social distinctions, and it was pointed out that the calling up of men for this auxiliary service would set free a number of men fit for military service but hitherto employed on civil duties. The Government expressed the hope that the volunteers would be so numerous that actual resort to compulsion would be necessary only in rare cases.

The Bill was fully debated in the Reichstag, and the third reading was passed on December 2 by 235 votes to 19, the minority consisting of the anti-war Socialists. It was then

passed rapidly through the Bundesrat, thus becoming the law of the land.

The end of the year brought dramatic events. The German Government in agreement with all its allied Governments proposed, publicly and definitely, that peace negotiations should be opened. From the diplomatic point of view, this was by far the most important event which had occurred since war broke out. An emergency meeting of the Reichstag was summoned for December 12, and the Chancellor made his announcement to a crowded House, even members serving in the army at the front having been recalled for the occasion.

After reviewing the military situation, more particularly the utter failure of Rumania's offensive against Hungary and the success of the German resistance on the Somme, the Chancellor continued: "Our strength has not made our ears deaf to our responsibility before God, before our own nation, and before humanity. The declarations formerly made by us concerning our readiness for peace were evaded by our adversaries. Now we have advanced one step further in this direction. On August 1, 1914, his Majesty the Emperor had personally to take the greatest decision that ever fell to the lot of a German—the order for mobilisation which he was compelled to give as the result of the Russian mobilisation. During these long and earnest years of war the Emperor has been moved by a single thought: how peace could be restored so as to safeguard Germany after the struggle in which she has fought victoriously. Nobody can better testify to this than I who bear responsibility for all the actions of the Government. In a deep moral and religious sense of duty towards this nation, and beyond it towards humanity, the Emperor now considers that the moment has come for official action towards peace. His Majesty, therefore, in complete harmony and in common with our allies, has decided to propose to the hostile Powers to enter into peace negotiations. This morning I transmitted a note to this effect to all the hostile Powers through the representatives of those Powers which are watching over our interests and rights in hostile States. I have asked the representatives of Spain, the United States of America, and Switzerland to forward that note. The same procedure has been adopted to-day in Vienna, Constantinople, and Sofia. Other neutral States and his Holiness the Pope have been similarly informed." The following is the text of the Note: "The most terrific war ever experienced in history has been raging almost two years and a half over a large part of the world—a catastrophe which more than a thousand years of common civilisation was unable to prevent and which has injured the most precious achievements of humanity. The spiritual and material progress which was the pride of Europe at the beginning of the Twentieth Century is threatened with ruin. Germany and her allies, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, have given proof of their unconquerable strength in this struggle. They have

gained important successes at war. Our lines stand unshaken against the ever-repeated attempts made by the armies of our enemies. The last attack in the Balkans has been rapidly and victoriously overcome. The most recent events have demonstrated that a further continuance of the war will not result in the breaking of the resistance of our forces, and the whole situation with regard to our troops justifies our expectations of further successes.

"The four allied Powers were obliged to take up arms for the defence of their existence and the liberty of national evolution. The glorious deeds of our armies have in no way altered their purpose. We have always maintained the firm belief that our own rights and just claims in no way conflict with the rights of other nations. Our aims are neither to shatter nor to annihilate our adversaries. In spite of our consciousness of our military and economic strength and our readiness to continue the war, which has been forced upon us, until the bitter end, if such be necessary, but at the same time prompted by the desire to avoid further bloodshed and to make an end of the horrors of war, the four allied Powers have proposed to enter forthwith into peace negotiations. The propositions which they would bring forward to such negotiations, and which have for their object a guarantee of the existence, honour, and liberty of evolution for their nations, are, according to their firm belief, an appropriate basis for the establishment of a lasting peace. If in spite of this offer of peace and reconciliation the struggle should go on, the four allied Powers are resolved to continue it to a conclusion, but they solemnly decline every responsibility for this before humanity and history."

After reading the note, the Chancellor referred again to the German confidence in success, and said that if the proposals were declined, "then even in the least and smallest homes every German heart will burn with sacred wrath against our enemies, who are unwilling to stop human slaughter in order that their schemes of conquest and annihilation may continue. In a fateful hour a fateful decision has been taken. God will help. We can proceed upon our way without fear and unshamed. We are ready for fighting and we are ready for peace."

The German Government sent a simultaneous note to the Pope, recounting at length the injury done by the war to civilisation and religion, and requesting that the efforts to secure peace might receive the support of the Holy See.

The peace move was extremely popular in Germany, where the people were urgently desirous of obtaining peace at the earliest possible moment. Only amongst some of the extreme chauvinists was the Chancellor's speech received somewhat coldly. The German proposal, as described elsewhere (see English History), was summarily rejected by the Entente. The next move was made by the American President (see U.S.A., p. 343). The German Government replied to Mr.

Wilson's note on December 26, agreeing to his proposal that peace negotiations should be opened, but refraining from defining precisely the peace terms that the Central Powers would accept or consider. The German reply stated that "in the President's communication the President points out that which he has at heart and leaves open the choice of a road. To the Imperial Government an immediate exchange of views seems to be the most appropriate road to reach the desired results. It begs, therefore, in the sense of the declaration made on December 12, which held out a hand for peace negotiations, to propose an immediate meeting of delegates of the belligerent States at some neutral place."

II. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

The fact which perhaps strikes the historian most forcibly in considering the condition of Austria-Hungary at the beginning of 1916 is that over the greater part of that monarchy parliamentary life had practically ceased to exist. In this respect Austria-Hungary was unique among the greater belligerents in the European War. In all the other countries, even in Russia, the parliaments had continued their activities during the war. British, French, and German statesmen constantly made pronouncements of the first importance in their respective parliaments, and enlightening debates took place, but the voice of Austria was almost silent. The Reichsrath, the Austrian Imperial Parliament, had been closed since the beginning of the war, and the same was true of all the seventeen provincial diets of Austria, and of the Croatian legislature. Only in Hungary—in Hungary proper—did the nation's representatives continue to carry on their functions. The sessions of the Hungarian Parliament had not been suspended, and from time to time informing debates were held. But important though the Hungarian Premier, Count Tisza, and his Government and Parliament might be, this does not compensate the chronicler for the closure of the Reichsrath, for one is thereby prevented from following satisfactorily the flow of public opinion in the larger part of the monarchy, which would have been revealed, at least in some imperfect degree, if the Austrian parliament had been open.

There can be no doubt that this anomalous state of affairs was a sign of weakness and internal dissension. Indeed, in the cases of some of the provincial diets this was admittedly the reason of the suspension. The Prime Minister of Dalmatia, Herr Trumbitch, had fled the country and had come to London to throw in his lot with Austria's enemies. And even before the war it had been necessary on occasion to close the Bohemian parliament, owing to the riotous feuds between the German and Czech deputies. And it may be assumed that the Austrian Government felt that with large numbers of the Slavonic popu-

gained important successes at war. Our lines stand unshaken against the ever-repeated attempts made by the armies of our enemies. The last attack in the Balkans has been rapidly and victoriously overcome. The most recent events have demonstrated that a further continuance of the war will not result in the breaking of the resistance of our forces, and the whole situation with regard to our troops justifies our expectations of further successes.

"The four allied Powers were obliged to take up arms for the defence of their existence and the liberty of national evolution. The glorious deeds of our armies have in no way altered their purpose. We have always maintained the firm belief that our own rights and just claims in no way conflict with the rights of other nations. Our aims are neither to shatter nor to annihilate our adversaries. In spite of our consciousness of our military and economic strength and our readiness to continue the war, which has been forced upon us, until the bitter end, if such be necessary, but at the same time prompted by the desire to avoid further bloodshed and to make an end of the horrors of war, the four allied Powers have proposed to enter forthwith into peace negotiations. The propositions which they would bring forward to such negotiations, and which have for their object a guarantee of the existence, honour, and liberty of evolution for their nations, are, according to their firm belief, an appropriate basis for the establishment of a lasting peace. If in spite of this offer of peace and reconciliation the struggle should go on, the four allied Powers are resolved to continue it to a conclusion, but they solemnly decline every responsibility for this before humanity and history."

After reading the note, the Chancellor referred again to the German confidence in success, and said that if the proposals were declined, "then even in the least and smallest homes every German heart will burn with sacred wrath against our enemies, who are unwilling to stop human slaughter in order that their schemes of conquest and annihilation may continue. In a fateful hour a fateful decision has been taken. God will help. We can proceed upon our way without fear and unshamed. We are ready for fighting and we are ready for peace."

The German Government sent a simultaneous note to the Pope, recounting at length the injury done by the war to civilisation and religion, and requesting that the efforts to secure peace might receive the support of the Holy See.

The peace move was extremely popular in Germany, where the people were urgently desirous of obtaining peace at the earliest possible moment. Only amongst some of the extreme chauvinists was the Chancellor's speech received somewhat coldly. The German proposal, as described elsewhere (see English History), was summarily rejected by the Entente. The next move was made by the American President (see U.S.A., p. 343). The German Government replied to Mr.

Wilson's note on December 26, agreeing to his proposal that peace negotiations should be opened, but refraining from defining precisely the peace terms that the Central Powers would accept or consider. The German reply stated that "in the President's communication the President points out that which he has at heart and leaves open the choice of a road. To the Imperial Government an immediate exchange of views seems to be the most appropriate road to reach the desired results. It begs, therefore, in the sense of the declaration made on December 12, which held out a hand for peace negotiations, to propose an immediate meeting of delegates of the belligerent States at some neutral place."

II. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

The fact which perhaps strikes the historian most forcibly in considering the condition of Austria-Hungary at the beginning of 1916 is that over the greater part of that monarchy parliamentary life had practically ceased to exist. In this respect Austria-Hungary was unique among the greater belligerents in the European War. In all the other countries, even in Russia, the parliaments had continued their activities during the war. British, French, and German statesmen constantly made pronouncements of the first importance in their respective parliaments, and enlightening debates took place, but the voice of Austria was almost silent. The Reichsrath, the Austrian Imperial Parliament, had been closed since the beginning of the war, and the same was true of all the seventeen provincial diets of Austria, and of the Croatian legislature. Only in Hungary—in Hungary proper—did the nation's representatives continue to carry on their functions. The sessions of the Hungarian Parliament had not been suspended, and from time to time informing debates were held. But important though the Hungarian Premier, Count Tisza, and his Government and Parliament might be, this does not compensate the chronicler for the closure of the Reichsrath, for one is thereby prevented from following satisfactorily the flow of public opinion in the larger part of the monarchy, which would have been revealed, at least in some imperfect degree, if the Austrian parliament had been open.

There can be no doubt that this anomalous state of affairs was a sign of weakness and internal dissension. Indeed, in the cases of some of the provincial diets this was admittedly the reason of the suspension. The Prime Minister of Dalmatia, Herr Trumbitch, had fled the country and had come to London to throw in his lot with Austria's enemies. And even before the war it had been necessary on occasion to close the Bohemian parliament, owing to the riotous feuds between the German and Czech deputies. And it may be assumed that the Austrian Government felt that with large numbers of the Slavonic popu-

lation of the country actively disloyal, a session of the Reichsrath would not enhance the reputation of the empire. The Austrian Government itself remained, of course, legal and constitutional; the emperor had not instituted a personal autocratic administration; Count Stürgkh, the Austrian Prime Minister, continued in control of the country's affairs.

At the beginning of the year the financial position of the monarchy was serious, but not perhaps very much more serious than the condition of France, Germany, and Russia. Austria-Hungary was poorer than any of those three countries, but on the other hand her expenditure on the war was not so great. Early in 1916 the Dual Monarchy was spending approximately 60,000,000*l.* per month on the war, but the average of the first seventeen months of the war was considerably less than this, rather less than 50,000,000*l.* per month, since the cost of munitions and armament generally was constantly growing in Austria-Hungary, as elsewhere. The total war-expenditure to the end of 1915 was not over 800,000,000*l.*, and of this sum 557,000,000*l.* had been covered by the three Austrian and the three Hungarian loans. Now the debts of Austria and Hungary before the war together amounted to 815,000,000*l.*, so that the monarchy commenced the year with a total burden of 1,600,000,000*l.*, a very large sum, it is true, but much less than the respective debts of France and Germany.

The attitude of the different nationalities of the monarchy towards the war was described in full in the last number of the *ANNUAL REGISTER* (see A.R., 1915, pp. 228-230). The progress of events had tended to re-establish somewhat the influence of Vienna amongst the Roman Catholic Jugo-Slavs. Some of these, notably the majority of the Croats, had always been loyal to the Habsburgs; but others, especially the Dalmatians, had been caught by that Pan-Serbian propaganda which was so rife amongst their Greek Orthodox co-nationals. This propaganda received, however, a severe check through the agreement between the Triple Entente and Italy, by which it was arranged that the northern half of Dalmatia should be ceded to Italy in the event of victory,—this agreement having become an open secret. Now the "Italians" in this district were a negligible minority,¹ and the Dalmatians, although they had no special love for Vienna, preferred on all grounds to remain linked to Austria, rather than to be handed over to Italy. It must be remembered that Vienna, unlike Berlin and Buda-Pest, had for many years adopted a very liberal policy in regard to the conquered nationalities, and moreover many Dalmatians thought that if they remained part of Austria, they would have a better chance of ultimate union with Serbia than they would have if the Entente Powers forcibly united them to Italy.

¹ That this scheme was a violation of the "Principle of Nationality" was not denied. The Italian point of view was that the proposed annexation was justifiable on strategic and commercial grounds.

In Bohemia the nationalist agitation continued beneath the surface, but owing to the all-pervading power of martial law, nothing in the nature of an organised outbreak could occur. Few things in Austria were more remarkable than the contrast between the success of the Imperial authorities in dealing with the Galician Poles and their failure with the Czechs. Both these nationalities were Roman Catholic Slavs, and were therefore bound in religion, at least, to Central rather than to Eastern Europe, and both provinces possessed similar and fairly wide measures of home-rule. Probably the reason for this contrast was to be found in the fact that in Bohemia, but not in Galicia, there dwelt large numbers of German-Austrians; so that there existed in the former province rivalry between the German and Slav elements in local and provincial affairs, whereas in Galicia the Poles were unquestioned masters in their own house. The quarrel of the Czechs was primarily not with the Imperial Government at Vienna, nor with German Austria, but with the Germans of Bohemia, whom the Czechs regarded somewhat in the light of intruders. The Poles had no cause to fear that in spite of home-rule their province might become German, but the Czechs had great reason to fear it.

The events of the year tended to enhance this contrast. Owing to the disloyalty of the Czechs the Austrian Government deposed the Bohemian language from its position as an official language of the province, and the manifestations of Czech nationalism were forcibly suppressed. Galicia on the other hand was promised an even larger measure of autonomy than it already possessed, and owing to their intense and fervent loyalty to Austria, the Poles came to occupy beyond all dispute the place of the third most important nationality of the heterogeneous Habsburg dominions.

As already stated the proceedings in the Hungarian parliament were often of great interest. On June 13, for instance, Count Tisza read an important letter from Baron Burian, the Foreign Minister, replying to Sir E. Grey's statements on the origins of the war. Baron Burian affirmed that in recent years Serbia had merely been a tool of Russian aggression against the safety and integrity of the Dual Monarchy. After dealing with the Casablanca crisis of 1909, the Baron stated that when Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia the British Cabinet endeavoured to persuade Russia to refuse to recognise this abolition of an Article of the Treaty of Berlin, and thus tried to push Russia into war. Further, in spite of Sir E. Grey's creditable attitude at the Balkan Conference, in July, 1914, he had been largely responsible for causing the war, owing to the encouragement he gave to Russia. The Foreign Minister continued that it was now more important to decide who was responsible for the prolongation of the war, and stated that this blood-guiltiness rested upon the Entente, who persistently refused the offers of the Central Powers to negotiate a peace. Austria-Hungary and

her allies would therefore fight on with determination and hold the advantages which they had won until a durable peace could be secured.

In July there were rather important developments in Hungarian politics. It will be remembered that the so-called Independence Party in Hungary was in opposition. In fact, of the 413 members returned to the House of Commons by Hungary proper, only ninety-one adhered to the Independence Party.¹ The party leaders were, however, famous and influential statesmen, such as Count Karolyi, Count Apponyi, Count Andrassy, and M. Julius Juth. Hitherto the Independence Party had unanimously given their support to the war policy of the Tisza Administration, and had temporarily abandoned the disputes about Hungary's relations with Austria and about Hungary's domestic affairs, questions on which they differed, of course, from the Ministerialists. In July, however, there came a schism in the party, a section led by Count Karolyi breaking away from the war policy. This move was of no immediate parliamentary importance, since even if the whole party had followed Count Karolyi (which it did not), such a small minority would have been powerless to turn out the Government; but it was significant, in that it was the very first break away from the war policy by any non-Socialist party of either of the two dominant nationalities of Central Europe—the Germans and the Magyars. For this reason the move was very notable.

The secession of Count Karolyi finally occurred owing to a quarrel between him and Counts Andrassy and Apponyi, though the schism had long been threatening behind the scenes. During the absence of Count Karolyi from the capital at the beginning of July, Counts Andrassy, Apponyi, and Zichy made an arrangement with the Premier by which one member of the Official Opposition should become a member of the so-called "War Council," a temporary deliberative body, and thus share with the Government some part of their responsibility for the conduct of the war. Now since Count Karolyi was not only one of the recognised leaders of the party but was actually its president, he was naturally excessively annoyed at this obviously improper action, and therefore on July 7 he formally and publicly severed his political connexion with the other leaders, and commenced to form a party of his own. In this action he was supported by nearly the whole of the Opposition press. Count Karolyi had always been opposed to the idea of a coalition Government in Hungary, and although the step taken behind his back by the other leaders did not actually involve the formation of a coalition Ministry, it was a step in that direction. Count Karolyi had the support of M. Juth, and of twenty-four other members of the Lower House.

¹ It should be explained that this name is somewhat of a misnomer, since the party in question did not desire actual complete separation from Austria.

Count Karolyi and M. Justh immediately set about creating a new party, which they styled the "Independence and 1848 Party," in reference to the Hungarian rising of 1848. The Count stated at once that this action must not be taken to mean that he was behind other people in his determination to defend Hungary, and that it was a libel to call him pro-Russian. He had, however, never entirely agreed with the war policy of the Tisza Administration, and he now proposed to exercise his right to criticise it.

The new party drew up a definite programme, and the first item in that programme concerned war policy. Erroneous reports of the party's aims were spread by some of the newspapers of Entente countries. Count Karolyi did not aim at cutting Hungary altogether loose from Austria, and away from the Central Alliance, with a view to joining the Entente system. No such extreme objects were contemplated, and if they had been contemplated they could not have been publicly broached, since such an act would have been rank treason to the King of Hungary, a somewhat serious offence in war-time. The aims of the Karolyi party were constitutional and loyalist, but they did not lose in importance by that fact. The party proposed to bring influence to bear in the Hungarian parliament in order to get the official war aims of Hungary moderated, and thus to moderate the war aims of the Central Alliance as a whole. The Karolyi party desired to see a peace concluded immediately by negotiation, on the basis of a renunciation of all schemes of annexation by both groups of belligerents. This was an extremely unusual view in Central Europe. Nearly everybody in Germany and Austria, and the Ministerialists in Hungary, desired to see large territorial changes in the East though not in the West. The new '48 party also advocated a general league of nations after the war, with obligatory arbitration for the settlement of international disputes. They further demanded, in common with the more docile section of the Opposition, a more democratic franchise, a separate Hungarian State Bank, and fiscal independence of Austria, and they proposed to press these demands, which the Apponyi party were not doing. A new item was a demand for a separate Hungarian Army, with a Hungarian Staff, with the Hungarian language used in words of command (this particular claim was not new), and controlled at least to some extent by the Hungarian Parliament. Great importance was attached to this point in the programme. Much was also said about the proposed fiscal independence of Austria, as this "plank" in the programme was sharply contrasted with the current schemes for a customs union for all Central Europe, which were very popular in Germany and Austria. To sum up, the new Hungarian party had no desire to depose the King and formally separate from Austria, still less had they any desire to join the Entente against the rest of

Central Europe,¹ but they did advocate an intensive form of Hungarian nationalism combined with a peaceful cosmopolitanism. These Hungarian politicians held, as many thinkers elsewhere had held before them, that nationalism and cosmopolitanism could be regarded as two sides of a single political philosophy in sharp opposition to imperialism. The party gained a few more recruits, and soon numbered over thirty members of the House of Commons. Although the party was thus weak in numbers, both Count Karolyi and M. Justh were famous men; and they alleged that their supporters in the electorate were much more numerous than their strength in the House might seem to indicate.

The immediate developments in Hungarian politics had the effect, however, of enhancing the influence of that section of the Opposition which was supporting the Government, and especially of its leader, Count Andrassy. The latter was an extremely ambitious politician who was known to aspire to the great post filled with such distinction by his father, the post of Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister. During August Count Andrassy paid visits to Berlin and Vienna, and was received by the German Emperor, by the aged Emperor of Austria, and by leading statesmen of both empires. The course of events had brought the Andrassy section of the Opposition into much closer agreement with the Hungarian and German Governments. As for the Austrian Government, it possessed at this time extraordinarily little influence.

During July considerable excitement was caused in both Austria and Italy by the trial of a certain Signor Battisti. This individual had been member of the Reichsrath for Trent, but being also a member of the "Italian" community in Austria, and having Italian sympathies, when the war broke out between Italy and Austria-Hungary he had made his way across the frontier and joined the Italian Army. In July he was taken prisoner by the Austrians; and he was forthwith tried by court-martial as a traitor, was found guilty, and executed. This caused intense indignation in Italy, and great meetings were held in Rome and elsewhere protesting against the execution. The Italian Government brought in a parliamentary Bill to erect a monument to Battisti in Trent, after the annexation of that city to the Italian Kingdom. On the Austrian side, the defence of the execution was that Battisti had not been merely technically a traitor; that he had never been an honest irreconcilable; that he had been content to hold a high Austrian official position, had taken Austrian money, and had sworn fealty to the Emperor.

On October 21, Count Karl Stürgkh, the Austrian Prime Minister, was assassinated in Vienna. The Count was dining

¹ This was, however, the aim of the extreme Bohemian Nationalists; but the latter were treated as traitors.

in a hotel with a friend, Baron Aehrenthal (brother of a former Foreign Minister), when a journalist, Dr. Friedrich Adler, who had been seated at a neighbouring table, suddenly sprang up and fired three shots at the unfortunate statesman. The Count expired immediately. Baron Aehrenthal was also wounded, but the assassin then allowed himself to be seized without resistance, and he was at once handed over to the police. Adler was a violent Socialist and editor of an extremist journal, *Der Kampf*, and the troubles of Austria appear to have preyed on his mind. Count Stürgkh had been Premier since 1911. During his term of office the Austrian Government had been lacking in vigour, and had been content to play second fiddle to Hungary. Count Stürgkh's policy during the war had been chiefly notable for the undignified closing of the Reichsrath and for his rigorous oppression of the Czechs. Few such undistinguished men have attained such a high position. The Emperor appointed a certain Dr. von Koerber as Prime Minister, and this statesman formed a Cabinet of which the most important members were Herr Karl Marck (Finance Minister), Baron von Schwartzeneau (Minister of the Interior), and Baron von Georgi (Defence Minister). As will be seen, Dr. von Koerber's term of office was of very brief duration.

As described elsewhere (see Poland), on November 5 the Emperor of Austria joined with the German Emperor in proclaiming the Independence of Poland. This act was accompanied by another proclamation of more immediate importance to the Dual Monarchy. Influential personages in Austria-Hungary, such as Count Andrassy, had been advocating a different solution of the Polish question, namely, the annexation of Russian Poland by the Habsburgs, and the establishing of a united Polish state, composed of Russian Poland and Galicia, as a third unit of the Emperor's dominions, coequal in status with (the rest of) Austria and Hungary. Now the Galician Poles had throughout the war been enthusiastic supporters of the Central Powers, and this proposed union with the districts of Russian Poland, and the consequent improvement in their political position, had been very attractive to them. The Galicians were therefore somewhat disappointed when they learned that no such union was to take place. Nevertheless, the Emperor promised Galicia further political privileges, though the promise was couched in such vague language that it was impossible to be sure what was its precise meaning. On November 5 the official *Wiener Zeitung* published a letter from the Emperor to the new Austrian Premier, dealing with Galicia. After referring to the creation of an independent Polish state, the venerable Kaiser said that he had deeply appreciated the loyalty and bravery of Galicia, and proceeded as follows: "It is therefore my will at the moment when the new State comes into existence and coincident with this development to grant Galicia also the right to manage independently its own

internal affairs in as full measure as this can be done in accordance with its membership of the State as a whole and with the latter's prosperity, and thereby give the population of Galicia a guarantee for its racial and economic development. In informing you of this my intention I charge you to prepare suitable proposals for its legal realisation and to submit them to me." The reason why it is difficult to understand what this promise of autonomy meant is that Galicia already possessed provincial home-rule. All the Austrian provinces were endowed with local autonomy, the extent of the autonomy differing slightly in different provinces; and in the case of Galicia the powers of the provincial legislature were very considerable. It is possible that the Emperor only meant that these powers were to be still further increased, Galicia nevertheless remaining an Austrian province. It is, however, also possible that the letter was intended to indicate that Galicia should be ejected from Austria altogether, the province ceasing to send representatives to the Reichsrath, and being raised to the status of a semi-independent country, similar to Hungary. The old Emperor, however, did not live long enough to carry out his promise, and at the end of the year it was not known how far his policy in respect of Austrian Poland had been adopted by his youthful successor.

On November 17 it was announced significantly in Vienna that within a few days the Archduke Karl, the Heir to the Throne, would "have charge of affairs of the realm conjointly with the Emperor." It was well known in Court circles that the aged Emperor's strength was at last failing. At about 9 o'clock on the evening of November 21, the Kaiser Francis Joseph died at Schönbrunn. The Emperor had been suffering from a cold, which had affected his lungs, but the real cause of his death was sheer old age. Up to the day of his death, the Emperor's mind was clear, and throughout the last week of his life he gave audiences, engaged in political deliberations, and received state reports. At the time of the Emperor's death most of the important personages in the monarchy were present in the death chamber, including the Kaiser's two daughters, Princess Gisela of Bavaria and the Archduchess Marie Valerie, the Heir to the Throne and his consort, Baron Burian, Dr. von Koerber, and the higher officials of the Viennese Court. The monarch's decease was publicly announced in the capital at 11 o'clock the same night. The Kaiser Francis Joseph was born on August 18, 1830, and was therefore 86 years of age at his death. In the earliest years of his reign his policy was governed by narrow views of German ascendancy, and the story is told of him that he once made the remark that "he would rather be a private soldier in the palace of a German king than Emperor of all the Slavs." In the middle and later years of his life, however, the force of events modified his policy, if not his personal views, and the liberties bestowed upon the Hungarians and Galicians won him the

affections of at least some of his non-German subjects. During the last half-dozen years of his life the aged man was unable to exert his former control over the actions done in his name, and he had little responsibility for the policy which led Austria-Hungary into the terrible calamity which marked the close of his life. (A full obituary notice appears elsewhere. See Obituary.)

The Heir to the Throne was the young Archduke Karl Franz Josef, grandson of the deceased Kaiser's brother, Louis, and son of the Archduke Otto, who died in 1906. He was born on August 17, 1887, and in 1911 he married Princess Zita of Bourbon-Parma.

Immediately after his accession the young Kaiser showed that he possessed considerable energy and strength of character, and he straightway made his influence felt in Europe. His accession signalled a sudden revival of Austrian as distinct from Hungarian influence in the affairs of the Central Powers. On November 23 a letter from the Emperor to Dr. von Koerber was published in the *Wiener Zeitung* stating that the war must be continued until the enemy-powers realised that it was impossible to overthrow the monarchy, but that the Kaiser would do all in his power to bring about an honourable peace at the earliest opportunity. On the same day, the generals, officers and soldiers of the Austro-Hungarian army renewed their oath of allegiance in the name of the "Emperor Charles the First."

The funeral of the late Emperor, which was carried out with the elaborate ceremonial usual on such occasions, took place on November 30. On November 27 the body was removed from Schönbrunn to the chapel at Hofburg, where it lay in state until the 30th. The funeral service took place in St. Stephen's Cathedral and the body was buried in the imperial vault at the Capuchin Church. The funeral was attended by representatives of all the German reigning Houses, including the German Crown Prince, the King of Bavaria, and the King of Saxony, and also by the Crown Prince of Sweden, the Infante Ferdinand of Spain, Prince Waldemar of Denmark, the King of Bulgaria and other royal personages.

The first action of the new Emperor was to endeavour to bring about peace. It was known that the official proposal of peace negotiations made by the Central Powers on December 12 (see Germany) was made at the instance of Austria-Hungary, and at the personal wish of the Austrian Emperor. The Kaiser also quickly asserted his authority in the internal affairs of the monarchy, and this involved numerous Ministerial changes. On December 3 Prince Konrad Hohenlohe was appointed Austro-Hungarian Finance Minister, a post held provisionally by Baron Burian—in addition to the latter's position of Foreign Minister. Preparations were made for summoning the Reichsrath early in the next year. On December 14 it was announced

that Dr. von Koerber and the whole Austrian Cabinet had resigned. The Emperor first asked Herr von Spitzmüller to form a Cabinet, but after several days spent in negotiating with leading politicians, that statesman abandoned the task. The Emperor then sent for Count Clam-Martinitz, who succeeded in forming a Cabinet, which included Herr von Spitzmüller (Finance Minister), Baron von Handel (Minister of the Interior), Dr. von Forster (Minister of Education), Herr Bobrynski (Governor-General of Galicia) and General von Georgi (Defence Minister). Count Clam-Martinitz was a Czech 'noble, and although no very clear indications of the new Cabinet's policy were given before the end of the year, it was generally believed that Count Clam-Martinitz would adopt a much more Liberal policy in regard to the Bohemian province. This inference was confirmed to some extent by other changes which followed within a few days. Prince Hohenlohe resigned his post, and Baron Burian, the Foreign Minister, was transferred to the Common Ministry of Finance, the Emperor appointing Count Ottokar Czernin to be Foreign Minister and President of the Common Council of Ministers. Count Czernin was, like the new Austrian Premier, a Czech, and he had previously held the post of Ambassador at Bukarest. The transference of Baron Burian to a less important post clearly indicated a decrease of Magyar influence.

On December 12, when the great peace speech was made by the German Chancellor, no similar scene took place in Vienna, since the Reichsrath was still closed. A proclamation was issued in Vienna, however, which repeated, in different words, the arguments of von Bethmann-Hollweg, declaring that the defeat of the Central Alliance was manifestly impossible and that to continue the war further would be, on the part of the hostile Powers, a crime against humanity. In the Hungarian Parliament, Count Tisza read the Note of the Central Powers, and subsequently declared that Germany and Austria-Hungary had been waging a war of defence, not of conquest, and that they had always been ready for an equitable peace.

The Croatian Legislature met for a short session during December,—the first occasion on which this diet had been convoked since the outbreak of war. Both the Hungarian Parliament and the Croatian Diet passed the necessary resolutions arranging for the coronation of the new sovereign as King of Hungary, but the Croatian Opposition refused to take any part in the proceedings, on the ground that the Jugo-Slavs were oppressed by the Hungarian authorities. The Hungarian Parliament elected Count Tisza to act as Palatine at the Coronation, although he was a Protestant.

King Charles and Queen Zita were crowned in the Cathedral at Budapest on December 30, the ceremony being less elaborate than usual, owing to the war.

CHAPTER III.

RUSSIA, TURKEY, AND THE MINOR STATES OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE.

I. RUSSIA.

THE beginning of the year found the Russian Empire in a troubled state. In the preceding six months, Russia had only been saved from complete and irreparable military disaster by virtue of her immensity and her severe climate. The territory in the west of the empire occupied by the armies of Germany and Austria-Hungary was more than half the size of France, and also possessed a population half as great as that of the latter country. The conquered region constituted, however, only a small fragment of European Russia, albeit the most populous and the most highly industrialised fragment. In 1915 the ill-equipped Russian armies had been quite incapable of resisting the force of the Austro-German onslaught. If the French Army in 1914 had been equally outmatched it would inevitably have been cornered and utterly crushed. But the Russian hosts had the vast spaces behind them, distances which even the railway could not annihilate, and into those spaces they retreated, until the icy hand of winter came down upon the scene, rendering campaigning impossible for half a year. The German generals marched victoriously three hundred miles eastward, only to find themselves still faced by their numberless foes.

Although the military disasters had not been irreparable, they had nevertheless been serious, and it was clear that Russia would need all her energies to fortify adequately the new lines occupied by the armies in the winter, and that the reconquest of the lost territory would be a formidable task. Moreover, the internal situation of the country was such as to cause some uneasiness. The large majority of the Russian nation were heartily in favour of the war, and were prepared to make great sacrifices in order to prosecute the campaign to a victorious conclusion, but there existed serious friction between the majority in the Duma, the Lower House of the Russian Parliament, and the Imperial Government. The session of the Duma had been suspended in September, and greatly to the disgust of Progressive politicians the House had not been permitted to re-assemble before the end of the year. The majority in the Duma consisted of what had come to be known as the "Progressive Bloc." This Bloc was composed of a number of parties previously quite distinct from one another, namely, the less Conservative wing of the Nationalists, the Centre, the Octobrists, the Progressives proper, and the Cadets. This great composite party of moderate politicians was flanked on the one side by a combination of the so-called "Right" (the extreme reactionaries) and the more Conservative wing of the Nationalists, and on the

other side by the extreme "Left," being the Labour Party and Socialists. The Duma also contained a few Independents and Polish Nationalists. About 230 members belonged to the Progressive Bloc, about 100 to the combined Reactionaries, and only 23 to the Left, so that the Bloc possessed a large majority over all other parties combined. Now the Bloc parties were ardently in favour of the war and of adherence to the alliance with France and Great Britain. This was also, of course, the official policy of the Government, but the Bloc accused the Administration of gross inefficiency in the conduct of the war, and of ill-timed opposition to necessary internal reforms.

Now the Russian Government were, of course, responsible to the Emperor, not to the Parliament; but their political position was in reality intermediate between that of the Bloc and that of the Reactionaries. The latter not only differed from the Bloc on questions of internal politics, in their opposition to the proposal reforms and their dislike even of those meagre constitutional rights that the Russian people had already been granted, but a certain number of them, though not all, were also antagonistic towards the war. In so far as this was the case, the Entente policy had never gained such general acceptance in Russia as it had in Great Britain and France. In Great Britain and France small groups of "advanced" politicians, thinkers of the extreme Left, to use the Continental terminology, were opposed to the war on pacifist grounds, and a precisely similar body of opinion existed in Russia, where the Socialists had always been anti-war. But in Russia there existed also this other utterly dissimilar group of anti-war politicians, who were probably more numerous and certainly much more influential, since they included persons of high social position. In Russia the political extremes met in their opposition to the dominant foreign policy. The Socialists were not pro-German, but they were pacifist. The extreme Reactionaries were far from being pacifist, but they might be truthfully described as pro-German.

Now many Liberals suspected and feared that the Government might be influenced even in its foreign policy by these Reactionaries. The so-called "Monarchist" Congresses which were held at the end of 1915, and which represented the party that desired to re-establish a completely autocratic form of Government, were attended by statesmen who had remained members of the Government for nearly a year after war had broken out; and these same statesmen made speeches not only condemning the proposed reforms, but deploring the policy which had led to the conflict with Germany. From the tone of the speeches at these Congresses it was to be inferred that the Reactionaries would be prepared to welcome a separate peace with Germany. Much irritation was caused by the fact that the Government permitted the Monarchist Congress to be held, whilst at the same time proposed conferences of the Zemstvos

were suppressed by the Minister of the Interior. In particular, the Prime Minister, M. Goremykin, became very unpopular. The real position of the Russian Government probably was that they were sincerely in sympathy with the Bloc on Foreign Affairs, but on questions of internal politics were more in agreement with the Reactionaries, at least with the Conservative wing of the Nationalists.

Owing to his opposition to the Duma, the Prime Minister's position became increasingly difficult, and on February 3 it was announced that he had resigned and would be succeeded by M. Stürmer. The new Premier was a close friend of his predecessor, and like the latter was a politician of pronouncedly Conservative views, but he commenced his term of office by announcing that he would not consider any proposals for a separate peace and would endeavour to co-operate with the Duma.

The Duma was opened on February 22, and for the first time since the creation of that body, the Emperor himself attended this ceremony. After the religious service, the Tsar made a short speech in which he said that he was glad to be present among the representatives of his people, especially in the hour of the glorious victory in the Caucasus, and that he hoped the labours of the Duma would be crowned with the greatest success. M. Rodzianko, President of the Duma, then made a speech thanking his Majesty for the honour that he had conferred upon the House, and stating that the Monarch's presence there that day was an event of historic importance. The Tsar then departed amidst a great ovation.

M. Stürmer, the new Premier, then spoke. He stated that the Government were determined to pursue the war to a victorious conclusion, in full co-operation with Russia's Allies. He felt sure that on this point the Government and the House were entirely in sympathy. The internal politics of Russia were rapidly developing at the time when war broke out, and he was aware that even during the war this evolution could not be entirely stopped. The temperance policy had been highly successful, and reforms in the parochial and communal administrations, which were urgently required, would shortly be given attention. General Polivanoff, the War Minister, followed the Premier, and eulogised the recovery of the Army since the great reverses of the previous summer. A long speech was then made by M. Sazonoff, the Minister for Foreign Affairs. He repeated once more that he believed that the German Government had provoked the war, and had thereby incurred a terrible responsibility in the eyes of humanity, whereas Russia and her Allies were fighting to defend their "most sacred rights." The spirit of "Prussianism," which consisted of national egotism and lust of conquest, must be crushed. The Minister referred to the cordial nature of the alliance with France, Great Britain, and Italy, and said that all the rumours

of a separate peace were absurd, as the five Powers which had signed the Pact of London did not regard international treaties as "scraps of paper." The speaker then went on to make an important announcement concerning Poland. He re-affirmed the statement that it was one of Russia's chief aims in the war to bring about the reunion of Poland, and to establish Polish autonomy under the Tsar, by annexing the Polish provinces of Austria and Prussia (Bukovina, Galicia, Posen, West Prussia, and presumably also East Prussia). This, he said, was still the policy of the Government, and it had the approval of Russia's allies. Referring to the mistrust of Russia which existed in Sweden, M. Sazonoff declared that the Government had no aggressive designs upon Scandinavia, as they were looking for a free outlet to the ocean in quite a different direction. He further stated that he hoped that when the propitious hour came, Rumania would know how to strike a blow for the deliverance of the Rumanian districts of Hungary. After expressing his annoyance with Bulgaria and Greece, the Foreign Minister made cordial references to Japan, and said that the visit of the Grand Duke George Mikhailovich to that country on the occasion of the Mikado's enthronement, had been a fresh opportunity of cementing the friendship between the two empires.

In the course of the debate which followed, the speakers of the extreme left, more particularly M. Chkheidze, criticised the Government severely. M. Chkheidze's indictment was couched in such strong terms that the Russian Censorship at first refused to allow his speech to be published in the newspapers, but after a protest by the majority of the Duma, the Censorship withdrew this prohibition. M. Chkheidze said that the alleged championship of national freedom and the rights of small neutral nations by the Entente Powers was hypocrisy. Not only Germany, but all the Great Powers were grossly egotistical in their aims. He and his fellow Socialists desired, he said, to associate themselves with the efforts being made by their German and Austrian comrades to secure an immediate peace in which all sides should renounce their claims to annexations and war indemnities.

During the same debate much anxiety was also caused by disclosures relating to the occupied districts which were made by M. Miliukoff, one of the leaders of the Cadets. This speaker said that he had had smuggled correspondence with Poles still living in the conquered region. It appeared from statements made by these persons that the German authorities were endeavouring to win the affections of the Poles by promising to reconstitute Poland as an independent country, to which Prussia would be willing to cede Posen and which should include Vilna and most of Lithuania, though part of the Baltic coast would be retained by Germany. It appeared that the speaker had reason to fear that these German promises were having some effect, and he urged that the Government should give every

publicity to the Russian scheme for establishing Polish autonomy, which had been promised by the authorities early in the war.

During the next few days the Budget for 1916 came before the House. The estimated ordinary revenue for the year was 302,204,931*l.*, and the estimated ordinary expenditure was no less than 323,246,369*l.* During 1915 the expenditure on the war had been approximately 800,000,000*l.*, but the cost was increasing, and it was estimated that if the war continued throughout 1916, the Russian expenditure on war purposes would total 1,100,000,000*l.* It will be noticed that this war expenditure was almost equal to that of Germany (see Germany). Russia had lost much in revenue by the new temperance laws ; indeed, the direct loss to the State by the prohibition of vodka was reckoned at 70,000,000*l.* per annum. It was hoped, however, to raise 50,000,000*l.* by new taxation, but as will be seen from the above figures no attempt was made to meet any part of the war expenditure out of current revenue. A new internal loan for 200,000,000*l.* would be issued immediately. The Russian Imperial Debt on March 31, 1916, amounted roughly to 2,100,000,000*l.*

The alliance of the Russian Government with the Governments of France and Britain was necessarily of an opportunist character, but as explained elsewhere (see France) the alliance of the French and British democracies with the Progressive Bloc in the Russian Duma was an entirely natural union, and was only the expression of the close intellectual affinity between them. The great Western democracies and the Progressive Bloc held to the same ideals, both in internal and foreign politics. This fact was made very apparent by a proclamation issued early in March by the Constitutional Democratic Congress, the opinions expressed therein being, with minor modifications, those of the whole Bloc. This proclamation was as follows :—¹

“ We are entering on a fresh, perhaps a decisive, phase of the great struggle. It is more than ever necessary for us now to summon all the popular forces so as to carry the conflict to a successful issue.

“ Citizens, there is here no room for hesitation. It is impossible to permit Russia to emerge from the contest curtailed, humiliated, and enslaved. It is impossible to permit Europe to bow to the yoke of Prussian militarism, and the great European democracies to be weakened and crushed. It is impossible that the peoples who have linked their fate with the Allies should perish, that Belgium and Serbia should be wiped from the face of Europe, that Poland and Lithuania should remain in the clutches of Germany, that tortured Armenia should be again surrendered to the enslavers.

“ The task of repulsing the foe is inseparably connected with

¹ Quoted from *The Times*’ report.

the task of our internal construction. The recognition of this link has united the public forces and the majority in the Duma in the endeavour to organise the people for victory, but only by relying on the firm will of the country can this aim be realised and the obstacles to its path be removed.

"The party of popular liberty again exhorts all Russian citizens to preserve their former confidence and faith in the future and the powers of the Russian people. . . . Together with national victory over the foe, may the hour of internal renovation supervene, the hour of the universal triumph of liberty and right."

Throughout the summer the silent and largely subterranean struggle between the Progressives and the Reactionaries continued unabated. One triumph of the Progressives was the enforced retirement of M. Khvostoff, the Minister of the Interior, at the end of March. This Minister had made himself obnoxious to the majority in the Duma by his obstruction of all the Liberal movements in the country by every means that his office enabled him to use. In particular, he had thwarted the activities of the Co-operative societies, and had sent out circulars to the Governors of Provinces which accused the Jews of being responsible for the inflated prices of food and other necessities and which were thus calculated to provoke pogroms, and did in fact cause grave riots against the Hebrews in Baku. The immediate cause of his fall was, however, an attempt to use State funds for party purposes. The Minister belonged to the party of the Right, and he was, naturally, desirous of seeing the existing Duma, whose animosity he feared, dissolved. So he conspired with M. Sheglovitoff, one of the leading Reactionaries and a notorious pro-German, to have an enormous Monarchist Congress assembled, at which over 2,000 peasant representatives from all parts of Russia were to be present. At this congress resolutions were to be passed petitioning the Tsar to dissolve the Duma, on the ground that the majority of the members were in the pay of the Jews, and grossly misrepresented the wishes of the masses of the Russian people, the peasantry. M. Khvostoff proposed to pay the travelling expenses of these 2,000 delegates out of the funds of the Ministry of the Interior, but unfortunately for him the secret leaked out, and even the members of his own party in the Duma found it necessary under such circumstances to disown him, and he resigned amidst a chorus of disapproval from all sections of the Lower House.

A few days later, on March 29, the Minister of War, General Polivanoff, also resigned, but under very different circumstances, for this Minister had won a great reputation. He had taken office in the dark days of the Russian retreat from Warsaw, and the great improvement in the organisation and munitionment of the army since that time had been very largely due to his ability and efforts. He was succeeded by General Shuvaieff, who had previously been Head of the Commissariat Department of the War Office.

At the end of March debates took place in the Duma dealing with the future of the Dardanelles, a subject which was of interest not only to Russia, but to all Russia's partners in the world-war. M. Miliukoff said that all the Allies realised now that the question that had to be faced was no longer "shall the Straits be Russian or Turkish," but "shall they be Russian or German," since the control that Germany had obtained over Turkey was now almost complete. M. Miliukoff also stated that as long previously as April, 1915, the Russian Government had come to a complete and formal agreement with the French and British Ministers concerning the fate of the Dardanelles, and that this arrangement was highly advantageous to Russia, although it provided for the partial (not complete) neutralisation of the Straits. These statements were criticised somewhat severely by speakers of the Right, who maintained that Russian interests and prospects had been sacrificed to the wishes of France and Britain, but at this point M. Sazonoff intervened in the debate, and declared that it was quite erroneous to contend that the agreement was in any way detrimental to Russia's future interests. The text of this agreement of April, 1915, was not published, so that the Duma, and, be it added, the Russian, French, and British publics, were obliged to rest content temporarily with these statements of the Minister on the matter.

In May a great sensation was caused in Russia by the sudden arrest of General Sukhomlinoff, one of Russia's ex-Ministers of War. He was forthwith confined as a prisoner in the notorious fortress of St. Peter and St. Paul. General Sukhomlinoff had been responsible for military operations throughout the earlier phases of the war, when all the worst disasters had befallen Russian arms, and when enormous territories had been lost to the enemy. The charges brought against him were of a serious character, and included one that he had culpably failed to provide the army with a sufficiency of munitions.

In spite of the war the spring session of the Duma was far from fruitless in domestic legislation. One very important Bill which was passed was a measure giving more adequate rights to peasants. It must be remembered that the principle of the legal equality of all classes in the eyes of the State, which had been recognised for generations in Central and Western Europe, and for centuries in England, was still far from being recognised in Eastern Europe. Elements of serfdom remained. The lives of peasants were hedged about with all manner of restrictions—for instance, a peasant was not allowed to go outside his village without permission from the local authorities—and the aim of the Duma was to place them more on an equality with other classes.

The Duma also passed a Bill aimed at the bribery and corruption which have always been so rife in Russia. An official had hitherto been largely immune from prosecution for bribery,

since hitherto no case could be brought against him on this ground without the consent of a superior official, which could rarely be obtained, as the official class in Russia was inclined to resent anything in the nature of interference with a member of the bureaucracy. The Bill abolished this immunity, by making the reference to a higher official unnecessary.

The Duma also showed sympathy with the Jews, who still remained a class apart, with scarcely any of the rights of citizens. The lot of the Jews was especially pitiable at this time since a great part of that region of Russia where the Hebrews were permitted to reside, known as the "Jewish Pale," had been conquered by the enemy. The Government had perforce removed some of the old restrictions on the movements of Jews into other parts of Russia, but by no means all the irksome regulations were rescinded. The Duma expressed its sympathy with the Hebrews, but was not able to accomplish much in alleviation of their sufferings.

The propaganda of the Reactionaries continued throughout the summer, and although a public Congress of Monarchists was not held, a large private meeting of the party was held in July. The party sent a memorandum to the Tsar praying him to conclude an immediate peace with Germany, since the continuance of the war was, they alleged, strengthening the revolutionary elements in Russia, and was in every way disastrous to the empire. These Reactionaries did not mean by the expression "revolutionary elements" the extreme Socialists (who really were revolutionary) but the Progressive Coalition, who would have been regarded as quite moderate reformers in any other country in Europe, some of them scarcely being Liberals in the British sense of the word.

On July 23—the second anniversary of the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia—M. Sazonoff, the famous Foreign Minister, resigned office. No other personal change in the Russian Government could have been of equal importance to this, for M. Sazonoff was of course the Minister who conducted on behalf of Russia the fatal negotiations which immediately preceded the outbreak of war. He had been more responsible than any other Russian statesman for developing the entente with France and Great Britain. M. S. Dimitrievitch Sazonoff was born in 1861, and after a distinguished diplomatic career, spent largely at the Court of St. James, he became Foreign Minister at the end of 1910.

There existed no doubt that the cause of M. Sazonoff's fall was the strengthening of the influence of the Reactionaries, who held different views from the outgoing Minister on the question of the alliance with France and Great Britain. The Premier, M. Stürmer, became Foreign Minister, and it was believed that he was less favourable than M. Sazonoff to the policy of "fighting to a finish." From July onwards, for several months, the Reactionaries came very near to gaining

control of Russian policy. M. Stürmer had previously been Minister of the Interior; he was succeeded in that office by M. Khvostoff, previously Minister of Justice, and M. Makaroff became the new Minister of Justice. Both M. Khvostoff and M. Makaroff were extreme Conservatives. It was also stated that there had been a conflict of opinion between M. Stürmer and M. Sazonoff on the question of Poland, M. Sazonoff desiring to confer upon that country a real, if limited, form of provincial autonomy, whereas the Prime Minister opposed this idea, notwithstanding that the scheme was in accordance with and in fulfilment of the Grand Duke Nicholas's famous proclamation to Poles at the beginning of the war. At the time of this crisis in the Government, parliament stood adjourned.

Of all the numerous countries within the empires of the Triple Entente, few, if any, were more fortunate during the war than Finland. Much has been written in Western Europe on the theme of Muscovite tyranny over subject nationalities, and no doubt in so far as Poland and certain other countries are concerned there is much truth in the indictment, but in respect of Finland the accusations were always exaggerations. Finland possessed a generous measure of provincial autonomy, and the Finns were, and remained up to the end of 1916, entirely exempt from the Russian military conscription. The Finns, like the Irish, were not compelled to fight the battles of the Entente. Nevertheless a considerable number of Finns joined the Russian army as volunteers and some of these became commissioned officers. In July a general election for the Finnish parliament was held. The result emphasised the progressive character of the Finnish nation, for the immense majority of the successful candidates were politicians of the "Left." The new House was classified as follows: Agrarians, 19; Old Finns, 33; Young Finns, 22; Swedish Separatists, 21; Christian Workers, 1; Social Democrats, 103. Thus the Socialists obtained a small majority over all other parties combined. In Finland women not only possessed the parliamentary vote, but were also eligible to be elected to the legislature, and in this July election twenty-four of the successful candidates were women.

Not only did Finland escape the chief terrors of the war; it also reaped to the fullest extent certain incidental advantages. The commerce and trade of the country were booming. The iron and textile industries were doing extremely profitable business, owing to the fact that Russia was largely cut off from imports from foreign countries, and it was reported that these industrial concerns were in many instances paying dividends of 30 per cent. and over. Fortunes were made on the Helsingfors Stock Exchange. Prices for timber were greatly inflated owing to the dearth of imported coal, all the railways and factories in the country burning only wood fuel. There was no very serious shortage of food in the country, the exports of foodstuffs to

Russia proper being confined within very narrow limits by order of the Finnish Government.

During the year the Russian authorities performed, with the assistance of American engineers, a remarkable task in railway construction. With the Dardanelles closed against her, and the Baltic commanded by the German Navy, Russia was bereft of ice-free ports. The Arctic port of Archangel was crowded with shipping during the summers of 1915 and 1916, but in the winter—a long winter in these regions—the harbour was useless. Further west, however, the north coast of Russia is kept free from ice throughout the winter months by the influence of the Gulf Stream. The harbour of Ekaterina, upon which is situated the town of Alexandrovsk and the great barracks of Semionova, is kept open in this manner, but before the war little attention had been given to the potentialities of this part of the Murman coast, and no railway ran to Ekaterina. In the winter of 1915-16 a new railway was built, which ran from Semionova across the Kola peninsula to Kandalaksha, on the White Sea, and then ran along the coast to a small town named Kem. From Kem onwards a good line had already been built running southwards into the heart of Russia.¹ This new railway was completed early in 1916, but when the spring came it was found to have been very insecurely laid down, and the thaw broke the line to pieces in many places. The Government were determined to persevere, however, and set to work to reconstruct the railway in a more thorough manner. The task of building a railway across hundreds of miles of tundra was one of extreme difficulty, and the conditions, climatic and otherwise, were truly terrible for the labourers. Several thousands of Austrian prisoners were employed upon this work, and also thousands of Chinese coolies, but under the winter conditions the unfortunate workmen died in hundreds. In December it was reported that the railway had been completed for the second time.

Throughout the autumn the struggle between the Reactionaries and the Progressives continued to rage both above and below the surface of Russian political life. On the whole, the tendency of events was in favour of the Progressives, probably because the latter possessed the cautious support of the Tsar. At the beginning of October, a new Minister of the Interior was appointed, in succession to M. Khvostoff senior. The new Minister was M. Protopopoff, a member of the so-called "Octobrist" party, and his selection for the post was deemed a victory for the Progressive Bloc. Nevertheless, the secret conflict between M. Stürmer, the Premier, and the Duma majority continued. Much discontent was manifested in the country owing to the high prices of food. This increase in food prices

¹It was erroneously reported in the English press that the new line connected Ekaterina Harbour with Archangel. The line passed nowhere near Archangel.

was due, of course, not to any scarcity in the country as a whole, but to the very bad means of communication; and it was held that the organisation of the supplies by the bureaucracy was also very faulty and aggravated the evils due, in the first instance, to this scarcity of railways in the enormous country.

A new session of the Duma opened in November and this brought an open breach between the Premier and the Lower House. On the opening day (November 18) the Prime Minister did not trouble to attend the inaugural debate, and indeed none of the Ministers, except General Shuvaieff, the War Minister, were present at the proceedings. The Tsar had several interviews with M. Rodzianko, the President of the Duma, a few days later, and on November 24 it was announced that M. Stürmer had been appointed Grand Chamberlain of the Imperial Court, and that M. Trepoff, hitherto Minister of Ways and Communications, had been appointed Prime Minister. It was thus made clear that the Tsar was determined that his Premier should work at least in some kind of accord with the Duma. It was rumoured that M. Stürmer had been not unfavourably disposed towards the proposal of opening immediate peace negotiations—though not necessarily negotiations for a separate peace. It is impossible to be sure how much truth there was in this rumour, but certainly the idea of a peace by compromise was altogether opposed to the spirit of the Duma and evidently also to the wishes of the Tsar. M. Trepoff had been a fairly successful administrator, and he had taken a great interest in and had supervised the construction of the new Murman railway. He was not such an extreme reactionary as his predecessor and was prepared to work with the Duma and to fight the war "to a finish." The two men who were most instrumental in bringing about this change of Premiers were M. Rodzianko and a certain M. Miliukoff, one of the leaders of the Progressives in the Duma, who made a speech against the Premier on the opening day. The War Minister, who had refused to follow M. Stürmer in boycotting the Duma, was also heartily in sympathy with the new Premier.

The Duma reassembled on December 2, and on that date M. Trepoff made a long statement describing his policy. This statement contained an official announcement that the Allies had definitely agreed that Russia should possess Constantinople and the Dardanelles in the event of the Entente being victorious. It had long been known in Russia and elsewhere that such an agreement existed, but no authoritative and definite pronouncement upon the subject had ever been made until this occasion. The passage in M. Trepoff's speech referring to this important matter was as follows: "The vital interests of Russia are as well understood by our loyal Allies as by ourselves, and that is why an agreement which we concluded in 1915 with Great Britain and France, and to which Italy has adhered, established in the most definite fashion the right of Russia to the Straits

and to Constantinople. The Russian people should know for what they are shedding their blood, and in accord with our Allies, the announcement of this agreement is made to-day from this tribune. I repeat that absolute agreement on this point is firmly established among the Allies, and there is no doubt that after she has obtained sovereign possession of a free passage into the Mediterranean, Russia will grant freedom of navigation for the Rumanian flag, which now, not for the first time, floats in battle side by side with the flag of Russia." The remainder of the Premier's speech contained no very important declaration, but he reaffirmed the determination of Russia to continue the war until complete victory had been secured. The speech was constantly interrupted by noisy demonstrations from the extreme Left, and owing to the absence of any promise of Constitutional reform the Bloc received the Prime Minister somewhat coldly. A critical speech was delivered by M. Purishkevich, deputy for Kursk, who accused the Government of lax and dishonest administration, and who, although avowing himself a member of the Right, affirmed that the Government ought to work more in harmony with the representatives of the people. Both M. Purishkevich and other speakers especially assailed M. Protopopoff, the Minister of the Interior, who was alleged to have abandoned his Liberal principles since he had taken office. After hearing the statement concerning Constantinople, the Progressive Bloc sent a telegram to M. Sazonoff, thanking him for having brought about the agreement between the Allies on this vital question.

The debates in the Duma during the first half of December were of a very heated character, and much excitement was caused by an unpleasant incident in which M. Markoff, a member of the extreme Right, deliberately insulted the President of the House, M. Rodzianko, by calling him "a blockhead, a scoundrel, and a blackguard." A duel between these two gentlemen was threatened, but fortunately the affair was settled without recourse to any such extreme method.

During the last fortnight of the year the attention of Russians was mainly concentrated upon the German offer of peace. On December 14 a memorandum dealing with Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg's speech was issued in Petrograd. This note stated that the German move was in reality an attempt on the part of the Government to retain the support of the German people, who were utterly tired of the war, and who could only be induced to continue the struggle by fallacious statements that the Entente was responsible for the prolongation of the conflict. The note then denounced Germany's war-aims, and declared that all the sacrifices of the Entente would have been in vain if they consented to a premature peace with "an enemy who though exhausted was not yet decisively defeated." On the following day the Duma showed that it was in agreement with the Government's memorandum. M. Nicolas Pekrovsky,

who had been appointed Foreign Minister only the day before, made a long speech denouncing what he called the hypocrisy of the German proposals, and the House then passed a resolution stating that it was in favour of a "categorical refusal by the Allied Governments to enter under present conditions into any peace negotiations whatever," and declaring that a "lasting peace will be possible only after a decisive victory over the military power of the enemy, and after the definite renunciation by Germany of the aspirations which render her responsible for the world-war, and for the horrors by which it is accompanied."

On December 25 the Tsar gave expression to the same views in an order to his Armies, and at the same time reaffirmed his intention of creating a self-governing Poland out of the three sundered Polish districts.

At the end of the year M. Pekrovsky issued an official comment upon President Wilson's peace-note, and stated that whilst the President's humane ideas were appreciated, his proposal must be rejected.

II. POLAND.

A notable event in the history of Europe during the year under consideration was the resuscitation of the state of Poland, not indeed in its historic form of a truly independent country, but in a form almost exactly comparable to the "Grand Duchy of Warsaw" created by the great Napoleon.

It will be remembered that the two Central Empires had conquered the whole of Russian Poland; and the administrations set up by the Central Powers, a German administration at Warsaw and an Austro-Hungarian administration at Lublin, were therefore the *de facto* governments of the country. The German and Austro-Hungarian spheres were to a large extent separate and independent of one another. In contrast with their policy in regard to the conquests in the West, German statesmen publicly announced that the Central Empires proposed to make great territorial changes in East-Central Europe, to the detriment of Russia, and it was soon obvious that they intended to make some kind of concession to the spirit of Polish nationalism. The Polish language was revived and given an official position not only in the Austro-Hungarian sphere but even in the German sphere. A Polish university was established at Warsaw, which owing to the conditions of the country, had some semblance of a real Polish institution, in contrast to the farcical "Flemish University" at Ghent. Yet beyond the bare statement that Poland would not be "returned to Russia," no announcement of a definite policy was made for considerably more than a year after the conquest. This delay was known to be due both to dissensions between Germany and Austria-Hungary and also to sharp differences of opinion between different schools of thought in Germany.

At last, however, the expected announcement of policy was made. On November 5, General von Beseler, the Governor of Warsaw, issued the following proclamation:—

“To the Inhabitants of the Government of Warsaw.—His Majesty the German Emperor and His Majesty the Austrian Emperor and Apostolic King of Hungary, sustained by their firm confidence in the final victory of their arms, and guided by the wish to lead to a happy future the Polish districts which by their brave armies were snatched with heavy sacrifices from Russian power, have agreed to form from these districts an independent state with a hereditary Monarchy and a Constitution. The more precise regulation of the frontiers of the Kingdom of Poland remains reserved.

“In Union with both the Allied Powers the new kingdom will find the guarantees which it desires for the free development of its strength. In its own army the glorious traditions of the Polish Army of former times and the memory of our brave Polish fellow-combatants in the great war of the present time will continue to live. Its organisation, training and command, will be regulated by mutual agreement. The Allied monarchs confidently hope that their wishes for the political and national development of the Kingdom of Poland will now be fulfilled with the necessary regard to the general political conditions of Europe and to the welfare and security of their own countries and peoples.

“The great western neighbours of the Kingdom of Poland will see with pleasure arise and flourish at their eastern frontier a free and happy state rejoicing in its national life.

“By order of His Majesty the German Emperor,
“(Signed) von Beseler, Governor-General.”

On the same day an identical proclamation was read in Lublin by the Austro-Hungarian Governor-General of the Lublin district. According to the German reports the proclamation was received with enthusiasm by the populace of both cities. After von Beseler had read the proclamation in German, it was read again in Polish by Count Huttenczapeki, and a speech was then made by the Rector of the new Warsaw University, Dr. Brudzinski, in which he formally thanked the two emperors on behalf of the Polish nation.

As already stated, the ambitious scheme thus published to the world had not been adopted without much discussion, and alternative plans had been considered. Amongst the alternative schemes, the one which appears to have been most seriously contemplated, at least in Austria, was a plan to unite Russian Poland with Galicia and give the large Polish state thus constituted a status within the Habsburg Dominions similar to that enjoyed by Austria and Hungary, thus transforming the ancient monarchy from a dual into a tripartite realm. It is evident, however, that this plan of aggrandising the Habsburg domain in such a striking manner was opposed by the most influential

personages in Germany, and consequently the proposal, although seriously mooted and discussed, was not ultimately adopted. A third scheme, of a totally different and much less defensible character, had been suggested in Germany, and had been advocated by Prussian Conservatives. This scheme involved a new partition of Poland, one portion of what had been Russian Poland going to Austria, and another portion including Warsaw, becoming an integral part not only of the German Empire but of the Prussian Kingdom. It will be remembered that after the Third Partition of Poland, for a few years at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, Warsaw belonged to Prussia. Although this scheme was seriously proposed by the reactionary elements in Prussia, there was never any real chance that it would be adopted by the German Government.

In Germany, and particularly in Prussia, great emphasis was laid upon the condition that no part of Prussian Poland should be ceded to the new state. On November 20 the Conservative, Free Conservative, and National Liberal parties in the Lower House of the Prussian Parliament brought forward a motion asking the Government for guarantees that no part of Prussian Poland should be incorporated in the future Kingdom of Poland. Herr von Loebell, Minister of the Interior, made a speech stating that "every inch" of Prussian Poland would be retained, and that the idea condemned by the resolution was obviously not to be contemplated. The motion was adopted by the Ministry and was carried by 180 votes to 104, the minority consisting of the Catholic, Radical, Polish, Danish, and Socialist parties. The Clericals and Radicals did not desire Prussian Poland to be given up; they voted against the motion merely as a protest against the existing oppressive Prussian laws relating to the Polish subjects of the kingdom.

It should be added that the Government of Suvalki was separated from the German district of occupied Poland earlier in the year, and was linked to the Lithuanian administration at Vilna; and therefore it was presumably the intention of the Central Powers to exclude Suvalki from the proposed Polish kingdom.

The Entente Powers in general, and Russia in particular, were naturally incensed at the Austro-German resuscitation of Napoleon's Polish state, and Russia immediately issued a protest, which was followed by a joint protest to neutral Powers issued simultaneously in London, Paris, and Rome. The latter protest stated that the occupation of territory by a belligerent did not, in modern International Law, imply a "transfer of sovereignty over that territory" and that the Austro-German actions were therefore illegal, and that particularly the conscription of the inhabitants of an occupied district to fight against their own country was forbidden by Article 23 of the Provisions annexed to the 4th Hague Convention of 1907.

As stated elsewhere (see Russia) the Russian Government announced on more than one occasion that the Tsar's intention was to reunite Russian, Austrian, and Prussian Poland as a self-governing province of the Russian Empire.

Up to the end of the year no edict was issued conscribing the Poles for the new national army, which consisted therefore solely of volunteers; but there can be little doubt that surreptitious pressure was brought to bear upon young men in order to induce them to enlist. No neutral Power gave formal recognition to the new state.

III. TURKEY.

At the opening of the year it was paradoxically true to say that the Ottoman Empire was both stronger and weaker than it had been for many decades. The infusion of German officers into the Turkish Army had caused an improvement and a stiffening which were little short of marvellous, and the country which a few years previously had collapsed before the puny if vigorous Balkan States, was now putting up a formidable defence against much more powerful opponents. This success was only attained, however, at a heavy price. Germany and Turkey were by no means co-equal allies with equal status, except perhaps in name. On the contrary, the entire Turkish Empire was being rapidly permeated by German military officers and German civil advisers, and the influence of these was hardly less than it would have been if Turkey had been legally a protectorate of Germany. Never since the first rise to power of the Ottoman Turks had the Turkish State been controlled in this complete manner by a foreign country, and to all intelligent onlookers it was an obvious question whether much of the reality of independence would be left to Turkey if the Central Alliance won the war. It was apparent that there was a possibility that Turkey might very shortly bear the same relation to Germany that Egypt had come to bear towards Great Britain, and Morocco towards France.

The year opened well for Turkey in a military sense, for on the night of January 8-9 the last British contingents evacuated the Gallipoli peninsula. It will be remembered that a part of the invading force had been withdrawn before the end of the previous year. The last contingents, which were those that held the extreme tip of Gallipoli, were re-embarked without loss, the Turks not discovering that the movement was in progress until the last troops had left the shore.

Turkey was directly involved in several distinct campaigns, of which much the most important was that in Armenia, where the Turks were endeavouring, very unsuccessfully, to defend their territory from the advancing Russians under the Grand-Duke Nicholas, who was exacting just retribution for the horrible massacres and atrocities committed in this region by the Turks in the previous year. This campaign is described in detail elsewhere (see *The European War*, Chap. I.). The war in the

territory of Turkey's luckless neutral neighbour, Persia, was strategically an extension eastwards of the Armenian campaign, but the operations in Mesopotamia, where the Turks were opposed not by the Russians but by the British, constituted an entirely separate campaign. Further, within the Egyptian frontier the Turks also found themselves facing British troops, and this locality was perhaps notable on account of the fact that it was the only spot in the world where British territory was in the occupation of enemy forces. The British General Staff had decided not to defend the frontier of Egypt in the Sinai Peninsula, and the British troops had therefore been withdrawn to the Suez Canal, which was of course the real geographical frontier of the new Sultanate, though not its political border.

The Mesopotamian campaign is of special interest to British readers, and if that interest is apt at times to be painful, it should not be forgotten that having regard to the immense scale of the world-war the operations in Mesopotamia were a very minor incident—a mere skirmish at the outposts of the British Empire. It will be remembered that General Townshend had been ordered by his military superiors to march upon and capture Bagdad, although the force under his command, consisting of only one division, was, as the event showed, utterly inadequate for such a task. After failing to reach Bagdad, General Townshend had retreated down the Tigris, but before he could reach the British base at Amara, he was surrounded by the greatly superior Ottoman forces, and on December 3 he found himself beleaguered in the small town of Kut-el-Amara.

A relief force was organised at Amara and was placed under the command of General Aylmer. The Turks, having surrounded General Townshend, sent a force about twenty-five miles down the Tigris, and there endeavoured to block the advance of the relief expedition. The first action resulted in a success for General Aylmer. On January 6 he took the offensive and drove the Turks from their positions. The Turks rallied, however, six miles below Kut, and prepared to resist in a highly defensible position at Es Sinn. On March 8 General Aylmer, after two months' preparation and acting on the instructions of the Commander-in-Chief in Mesopotamia, General Sir Percy Lake, assaulted the Es Sinn lines, but after fighting all day the British failed to move the Turks. The expedition was hampered by floods, which rendered it impossible to outflank the Turkish defences, and the frontal attack which thus became necessary was an extremely difficult operation in such flat country. Another attempt to break through, on April 5, after meeting with some preliminary success, also failed thoroughly to dislodge the Turks. It was now becoming apparent that the relief of Kut was very dubious. General Aylmer had now been relieved of his command, and General Gorringe was appointed in his stead. A second attack by General Gorringe on both sides of the Tigris on April 9 met with no real success. Slight advances were made,

but the Turks still maintained their position below Es Sinn. On April 23 yet another attempt was made to break through, but once more the Turkish lines proved too strong. The garrison of Kut were now at the limit of their resources in food, though apparently the supplies of ammunition were not exhausted. The attempts to storm the enemy's lines having failed, an effort was made to revictual the garrison by water. A ship laden with supplies was sent up the Tigris on the night of April 24 in the hope that it would be able to run the gauntlet of the Ottoman lines. The Turks discovered the ship, however, and she was driven ashore by gunfire about four miles below Kut. This new disaster finally sealed the fate of the garrison and on April 29 General Townshend surrendered unconditionally, but before doing so he destroyed his guns and munitions of war. The captured garrison numbered 2,970 British troops, and about 6,000 Indian troops, with their followers, the number of whom was not reported by the British authorities.

Although the operations were thus on a very small scale, the unfortunate incident caused much dissatisfaction in England, and disputes took place as to who should be held responsible for the reverses. The upshot of the matter was that no blame whatever could be attached to Generals Townshend, Lake, Gorringe, or even to General Aylmer. An error of judgment appeared to have been committed by General Nixon, the Commander-in-Chief in Mesopotamia, who was superseded by General Lake in January, but the main responsibility rested upon the Indian War Department and the Imperial War Office, for having sanctioned the advance of General Townshend's petty force hundreds of miles into the territory of a formidable military empire. It appeared that General Townshend's own opinion had been that the force under his command was much too small for the task of capturing Bagdad.

At the end of April a number of members of the German Reichstag paid an official visit to Constantinople, and at a banquet given in honour of the visitors on April 27, Halil Bey, the Minister of the Interior, made an important announcement. He stated that the Triple Alliance had now been definitely and formally resuscitated, Turkey taking the place therein which had been previously occupied by Italy. The alliance, said the Minister, had been concluded for a long period, and "Turkey had regained her independence by entering, on equal terms, into the Triple Alliance." Halil Bey added that various minor agreements had also been concluded between Turkey and Germany covering such matters as Consular jurisdiction, right of residence, etc., and in none of these agreements was any trace of the old Capitulations to be found.

In the internal history of the Ottoman Empire much the most important event was a movement for Arabian independence which sprang up. On June 9 the Grand Shereef of Mecca declared himself independent of the Turkish Government. Mecca

and the surrounding district proved loyal to the Shereef, and the Turkish garrison in Jeddah was overcome. Taif was speedily captured, but the Turkish force in Medina was more formidable, and the Arabs, although in superior numbers, were not able completely to invest the city. It was reported that the Arabs tore up over a hundred miles of the track of the Hejaz Railway, and this of course placed a serious obstacle in the way of Turkish reinforcements. It appears, however, that the Turks were too seriously involved elsewhere to be able to spare any large force for the purpose of quelling the Arab revolt. It was announced in Constantinople, however, that the Grand Shereef Hussein Pasha had been deposed, a certain Ali Haidar Bey (Vice-President of the Turkish Senate) being appointed Shereef in his stead. As a reply to this, and by way of explaining his attitude to his fellow Moslems, Shereef Hussein issued a long proclamation, which was first published in Cairo. The proclamation set out a large number of indictments against the Turkish Committee of Union and Progress from the point of view of a strict Moslem, especially against Enver Pasha, Jemal Pasha, and Talaat Bey; and formally announced to the Moslem world that the Shereefate of Mecca was henceforth independent. Later in the year another manifesto was published, and finding that the Turkish Government were unable to send any large army to suppress the revolt, Shereef Hussein became more daring. On November 4 the Shereef had himself formally proclaimed "Sultan of Arabia"; and a large number of Arab chiefs assembled in Mecca for the ceremony.

The Turkish Heir-apparent, Yussuf Izz-ed-Din, died in January, as was said by his own hand.

IV. RUMANIA.

During the year Rumania encountered a series of disasters. In January the country was the one prosperous and happy locality in Eastern Europe, having preserved its strict neutrality in the war throughout 1915. The situation in Rumania bore, however, distinct resemblances to that of Italy before the latter country's intervention in the war, and the neutrality of Rumania never possessed that quality of sheer aloofness which was so characteristic of nearly all the Teutonic neutrals. On the contrary the Government and the ambitious ruling circles of the country were keenly interested in the great struggle, and, as was subsequently proved, they were only awaiting a favourable opportunity, or what they regarded as a favourable opportunity, to intervene in the war on the side of the Entente.

Throughout the war M. Take Jonescu, one of the leaders of the Conservative Democrats, had been advocating intervention on the side of the Entente, and he was supported by nearly all the Conservative Democrats, as well as by many of the Conservatives proper. The Government and their Liberal followers were of necessity much less frank, so long as the country re-

mained neutral, but it was a matter of common knowledge that the Liberal Party, which possessed an enormous majority in the Parliament, were sympathetic with the Entente rather than with the Central Powers. Thus either openly or secretly the great majority of the upper and middle classes of Rumania harboured "irredentist" opinions, and had their eyes fixed upon Transylvania. Among the masses of the people, however, irredentism had less hold. The parallel between Italy and Rumania in this respect was far from exact. In Rumania irredentism had somewhat the character of an ethnological cult, fashionable in educated circles; Italian irredentism was a popular passion. A small portion of Italy, of the country of the Italians, remained under a foreign yoke, and all Italians knew it and felt it. But the enlarged Rumania of the Rumanian irredentists had only existed for a few decades of the two thousand years of Rumanian history, and nearly half the population of the territory which the enthusiasts now proposed to "recover" and "redeem" was, and had been for centuries, non-Rumanian. The fact that Rumanian irredentism was more artificial and less spontaneous than that of Italy should be borne in mind, because it accounts in part for what occurred after the outbreak of war.

The first months of the year passed quietly, and the spring session of Parliament, which opened on February 2, was uneventful. The population and vital statistics of the country for the year 1914 were published early in 1916, and showed that the Rumanians were still a prolific people. The birth-rate was 42.1 per 1000, the total number of births being 327,345. Unfortunately, however, the infant mortality was also high, and the country's death-rate was 23.5 per 1000.

For the earlier months of the year there is little to record. The country was extremely prosperous, as the people were able to obtain very high prices for their produce in all the neighbouring lands. The Government remained, however, chiefly interested in the international situation, and were only waiting to choose the moment to strike. At the end of August they believed that the opportune moment had come. An agreement had been reached with Russia respecting the Austrian and Hungarian districts which should be given to Rumania. On August 27 the King held a Crown Council at which the subject of intervention was debated for the last time. All the influential personages present, with the exception of the veteran statesman, M. Carp, were in favour of immediate intervention. M. Carp's objections were based upon principle rather than expediency, as he held that it would be dishonourable to attack the Central Powers, to whom Rumania had been allied. Even the pro-German faction do not appear to have been actuated by any fear of a Rumanian defeat. The same evening war was declared against Austria-Hungary. The note sent to the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister set out at considerable length Rumania's reasons for declaring war. The note stated

that when Rumania became attached to the Triple Alliance it had borne a defensive character. But the war with Italy and the Austro-Hungarian conquests in the Balkans had radically altered the situation. Moreover, when entering the alliance the Rumanian Government and people had hoped that friendly relations would tend to improve the lot of Rumanians living in the Dual Monarchy, but these hopes had not been fulfilled. Thus Rumania was forced to alter her path, and owing to her desire to hasten the end of the war and to safeguard her national interests, "Rumania found herself forced to enter into line by the side of those who are able to assure her the realisation of her national unity."

The events which followed are described elsewhere. The utter collapse of the Rumanian Army came as a complete surprise to the nation, as it did, indeed, to all the world, not excluding Germany and Austria-Hungary. The war, as already stated, was not universally popular in the country, nor were the Government's motives fully comprehended by the uneducated classes; but it was poor strategy rather than lack of warlike enthusiasm which was the chief cause of Rumania's undoing.

When the Germans entered Bukarest they were welcomed by certain pro-German politicians who had been left behind in the capital in order that they might induce the conquerors to make the conditions to be imposed upon the populace as little onerous as possible. Nevertheless, the Germans laid heavy taxes upon the city.

After the fall of Bukarest, the Premier, M. Bratiano, resigned; but the King persuaded him to reconstruct his Ministry.

V. GREECE.

The year 1916 was extremely eventful in Greece, and nearly every month was crowded with incidents. At the beginning of the year the situation in the country was of an extraordinary character, and it did not grow less extraordinary as the year went by. It will be remembered that when the Austro-German and Bulgarian forces threatened Serbia in October, 1915, a Franco-British army had been landed at Salonika, with the acquiescence of M. Venizelos, who was then Prime Minister, the object being to endeavour to save Serbia from being crushed by the enemy. Greece had a treaty of alliance with Serbia, and the Entente Governments, M. Venizelos and his Cabinet, and the majority of the Greek Parliament as then constituted held that the terms of this Treaty bound Greece to go to the assistance of Serbia in the circumstances which arose at this time, that is, October, 1915. King Constantine, however, had taken a different view, and had consequently dismissed Venizelos and had steadily refused to be drawn into the war. Thus the beginning of the new year found Greece, with a certain M. Skouloudis as Prime Minister, still maintaining an attitude of

neutrality, but with a portion of the land occupied by a Franco-British army. This force was based upon Salonika and was commanded by General Sarraill.

Although the Franco-British army had entirely failed to render any effective aid to Serbia, the Allied Governments had no intention of abandoning Salonika and withdrawing their troops from Greece. On the contrary, Salonika was fortified strongly and the army was reinforced. The developments which followed were such as might have been foreseen. It was a military impossibility for a great army to remain in a country which it did not control. Hence General Sarraill was perpetually taking over more and more of the work of administration in the district occupied by his troops. These encroachments gave intense annoyance to many Greeks, and anger was also caused when the Allies seized the Island of Corfu in January. Corfu was utilised as a station for the defeated Serbian troops, who had fled through Albania to escape from the Germans and Bulgarians. The Allies justified these actions on the ground that Greece was really an ally of Serbia, and that in being forced to render these services to Serbia and to the Entente, she was still doing less than her duty. On January 28 the Greek fort of Kara Bornu, situated near the entrance to the Bay of Salonika, was suddenly seized by the French.

The next step was taken in April. The French and British Governments informed M. Skouloudis that they were obliged to create naval bases at various points in the Ionian Islands and in the *Ægean*. The Greek Government protested, but did not attempt to prevent the seizure. A few days later the Allies demanded permission from the Government to transport the now reconstituted Serbian regiments from Corfu across the railways of western Greece to the Salonika district. The reason the Allied Governments made this demand was that to bring the Serbian troops round to Salonika by sea involved danger from German submarines. The Greek Government flatly refused to give the required facilities. The Government was in a stronger position in this matter than it had been in the questions of encroachments in the Salonika district and in the islands because the King's troops actually controlled the railway required and the whole of the country (western Greece) through which it passed. It was impossible for the Allies to seize this line without formally going to war with Greece, and therefore after several weeks had been spent in diplomatic discussion, the Allies withdrew their demand.

Up to this point the Bulgarians, Turkish, German, and Austro-Hungarian troops had not entered Greek territory, but at the end of May the Bulgarians crossed the frontier at various places, and occupied certain strategic points, including Fort Rupel. The Greek troops, acting of course under orders from the King's General Staff, offered no resistance, and the garrison of Fort Rupel quietly allowed the invaders to take possession of the stronghold.

This new development placed the Allied army in a somewhat perilous position, not so much because of the presence of the Bulgarians on its front and right wing, but because it was flanked on its left by the Greek Army, a very large part of which had been mobilised since 1915. The Greek Army was loyal to its pro-German king, and the Allied Governments were not unreasonably suspicious of that sovereign's intentions. Hence in the middle of June the Allies sent a peremptory note to Greece demanding the demobilisation of the Greek Army, the replacement of the Skouloudis Cabinet by "a business Cabinet, without political bias," a dissolution of the Lower House followed by a general election, and the dismissal of certain officials said to be hostile to the Entente. These demands were enforced forthwith by a blockade of Greek ports. Now Greece is dependent for a very large proportion of her food on foreign supplies, and the population thus being faced with starvation, King Constantine—for the King it was who was the real ruler—was compelled to give way. M. Skouloudis resigned and a demobilisation of the army was ordered, and a general election was promised but was not held. M. Zaimis was instructed to form a Government, and his new Cabinet included M. G. P. Ralli as Finance Minister, and General Callaris as War Minister. M. Zaimis himself, who although not a follower of M. Venizelos had always been favourably disposed towards the Entente, took the portfolio of Foreign Affairs.

After this change, the relations between the Allies and Greece were more amicable for a couple of months. In August the developments were rapid. The Bulgars advanced, unopposed by such Greek troops as remained mobilised. Russian and Italian contingents were landed at Salonika, and M. Zaimis resigned. Immediately after this the Venizelos faction, which was of course strongly pro-Entente, made a startling move. A revolution broke out at Salonika, which but for the intervention of the French would have led to violent fighting between the revolutionaries or Venizelists and the loyal troops. The local Venizelists formed a "Committee of National Defence" which was proclaimed independent of, though apparently not formally hostile to, the Athens Government.

In the meantime King Constantine had great difficulty in finding a Premier to succeed M. Zaimis. After various attempts had been made to form a Government, by M. Kalogeropoulos and others, Professor Lambros became Prime Minister, and he remained in that office until the end of the year.

The Bulgarians advanced to the sea and the port of Kavalla was surrendered to them on August 27 by the Commander of the Fourth Army Corps, whose headquarters were at that town. This led to another extraordinary incident, for the Bulgarians, or their German leaders, then conveyed the entire Greek Army Corps to Germany, where these neutral soldiers were interned as "guests." It is impossible to say what was the precise

object of this German action, but it was evident that the German authorities and King Constantine were on amicable terms with each other.

During the last three months of the year the friction between the King and the Allies was very acute. Owing to the menacing movements of the Greek regiments that were still mobilised, the Allies demanded the surrender of a quantity of munitions, the use of certain railways, the expulsion of certain pro-German agents, various limitations of Greek troop-movements, and other concessions. The King's Government refused these demands, and on December 1 the French Naval Commander, Admiral de Fournet, landed a force of 3,000 men near Athens, to enforce the demands. Fighting with the Royalists ensued, but an armistice was arranged, and the French Admiral withdrew his force. After this affray, the Allied Governments, who had already seized the Greek fleet, again instituted a blockade of Greece, and on December 14 another ultimatum was sent to the Athens Government demanding the removal of all Greek troops from Thessaly. At the end of the year the King had accepted this stipulation, but the situation remained most anomalous, with the Allies treating with King Constantine's Government in Athens, and also with a Government appointed by M. Venizelos in Salonika. Between the territories of the two Governments there was a neutral zone, several miles wide, guarded by Entente troops. Crete and most of the islands, as well as the Salonika district, adhered to M. Venizelos, and he and his provisional Government were, at the end of the year, raising volunteers to fight the Bulgarians. The British Government explained that each Greek Government was "recognised" by the Allies in the sphere in which it was actually exercising authority.

VI. BULGARIA.

Very little news of the internal condition of this kingdom reached the outside world during the year. Like all the countries within the ring of the Entente forces, the kingdom suffered from a scarcity of food, and in addition there was a serious outbreak of cholera in several districts. In politics there were no great changes, and the king and M. Radoslavoff's Cabinet, supported by the glamour of military success, were able to retain the confidence of the people. It will be remembered that the Opposition parties had opposed the policy of intervention in the war, but after Bulgaria had actually joined the Central Powers, many of the Opposition politicians had given the Government their informal support. Others, however, did not adopt that course, and some of these, including M. Ghenadieff, were accused by the Government of treasonable conspiracy and were arrested. Before the war, Bulgaria had been essentially an East European state, but its association with Germany and Austria-Hungary led to a Westernisation of the country's institutions in some respects, a process which was not always

harmful. Amongst the improvements thus carried out, the adoption of the Gregorian kalendar may be mentioned. Bulgaria was formally associated with her allies in the offer of peace which was made in December.

VII. SERBIA.

Serbia having been completely conquered in 1915, the country was administered by an Austro-Hungarian Governor-General throughout the year under consideration. Very little reliable news of the condition of the people reached England. It was reported that the inhabitants had been reduced to a state of abject poverty, and that the population, owing to the war and famine, had been much reduced. Enormous numbers of young children were reported to have died. The *de lege* Government of Serbia was domiciled in Corfu, contrary to the wishes of the Athens Ministry. At the end of March the Heir to the Throne, Prince Alexander, who was now Regent, came to London with the Prime Minister, M. Pashitch, in order to negotiate with the British Government on the great question of the creation of a united Jugo-Slav state after the victory of the Entente. The troublesome problem of the rival Serb and Italian claims to Dalmatia was no doubt discussed, but no official account of the results of the negotiations was published. In September a short formal session of the Serbian Parliament was held in Corfu. At the end of the year the Serbian troops had the satisfaction of reconquering a small strip of their own country, including Monastir (see The European War).

VIII. MONTENEGRO.

In January this small primitive state, which had entered the war as an ally of Serbia, was conquered by an Austro-Hungarian army under the famous commander, General von Koevess. The chief defensive position in Montenegro was the mountain called Mount Lovtchen, which not only commanded the Bay of Cattaro, but guarded the road to the capital, the small town of Cettigne. In order to make full use of this important strategic position, heavy artillery was necessary, however; and this the Montenegrins did not possess. It was expected that the Italians would supply these heavy guns, but they either could not or would not do so.

Owing to this handicap no very serious opposition could be made to the advance of Koevess's troops, after that general had been set free for his new task by the complete conquest of Serbia. The Austrians subjected Mount Lovtchen to a severe bombardment by their heavy guns, and stormed the heights on January 11. On January 14 the Austrians entered Cettigne. King Nicholas, with some of his ministers and a large part of the army, fled south into Albania, and reaching the sea, they escaped to a place of safety. The King went to France.

Some of the Montenegrin Ministers remained behind in

Cettigne, and formally capitulated to the Emperor's representatives. The Austrians proceeded to disarm the population in a rigorous manner, and therefore the country came completely under their rule.

In June a weak attempt at insurrection was made, but the Austrians suppressed this with much severity.

IX. ALBANIA.

After General von Koevess had conquered Montenegro in January, that commander's troops overran the greater part of Albania, including Durazzo. The extreme south of the country, the district known as Northern Epirus, had, however, been annexed by Greece, and now sent representatives to the Athens Parliament. Moreover, the Italians maintained their hold on another small district in the south, and at the end of the year, when General Sarraïl's army was advancing, the right wing of the Italian force in Albania established and maintained connexion with the left wing of the Salonika force. The Austro-Hungarian authorities did not publish any definite scheme for the reorganisation of the territory, but it was rumoured that they proposed to reinstate the ex-Mpret, Prince Wilhelm v. Wied.

CHAPTER IV.

LESSER STATES OF WESTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE: BELGIUM
—LUXEMBURG—THE NETHERLANDS—SWITZERLAND—SPAIN
—PORTUGAL—DENMARK—SWEDEN—NORWAY.

I. BELGIUM.

THROUGHOUT the year the whole of Belgium, except the small district around Ypres which had never been lost, remained under the tyrannical rule of the German conquerors. The *de lege* Belgian Government maintained its existence, however, and having the hospitality of the French Republic, it was established at Le Havre.

On February 14 an important declaration was made by the British, French, and Russian Ministers to King Albert's Court at Le Havre. This declaration, which was addressed to the Belgian Foreign Minister, Baron Beyens, was as follows:—

The Allied Powers signatory of the treaties guaranteeing the independence and neutrality of Belgium have decided to renew to-day, by a solemn act, the engagements they entered into with regard to your country. Consequently we, the Ministers of France, Great Britain, and Russia, duly authorised by our Governments, have the honour to make the following declarations:—

The Allied and Guaranteeing Powers declare that, when the moment comes, the Belgian Government will be called upon

to take part in the peace negotiations, and that they will not end hostilities until Belgium has been restored to her political and economic independence, and liberally indemnified for the damage she has sustained. They will lend their aid to Belgium to ensure her commercial and financial recovery.

The two other Great Powers, which though not guarantors of Belgian independence, were now allied to Russia, France, and Great Britain, namely, Italy and Japan, informed Baron Beyens that they had no objection to the above declaration.

One of the aims of the German Governor-General of Belgium, General von Bissing, was to foster any antipathy which might be found to exist between the two elements of the Belgian population, the Flemings and the Walloons. The Flemings were treated in a comparatively mild manner, and the foreign bureaucracy endeavoured to encourage the idea that the Flemish were a distinct nationality of "Low German" stock, who had been in the past oppressed and denied their full rights by their inclusion in the Belgian state. With this object in view a new Flemish University of Ghent was instituted under German patronage; the Rector of the University being, however, not a Fleming, but a foreigner, a citizen of the Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg, a certain Professor P. Hoffmann. The new University was not successful. At the end of the year it could only boast about sixty students.

The Belgian population suffered severely from the conditions of semi-famine which prevailed all over the huge regions within the circle of the Austro-German armies. And in the autumn the sufferings of the people were increased by the deportation by the authorities of numerous unemployed persons from nearly all parts of the country, these unfortunates being marched off by force, and set to labour in Germany and elsewhere.

II. LUXEMBURG.

Throughout the year this small country remained occupied by German troops, but since the Luxemburgers, unlike the Belgians and the population in the conquered districts of France, were neutrals, the lot of the people was more bearable than that of the hapless Belgians. The people suffered from economic depression and from the shortage of food due to the British blockade, but apart from these misfortunes, the Luxemburgers were better off than any of their neighbours—even than the conquering Germans, since they ran none of the risks of war.

Little reliable news of the Grand-Duchy reached the outside world. It was reported that the Grand-Duchess herself was not very ill-disposed towards the Imperial Authorities, but that the common people continued to resent the manner in which their country had been overrun. Nothing transpired as to the intentions of the German Government in regard to the little State, in the event of the Central Empires being in a position

to make their wishes respected at the peace settlement. Since, however, Luxemburg was a member of the German Confederation from 1815 to 1866, it might be taken as certain that the Imperial Government, if in a position to offer anything, would give Luxemburg the opportunity of taking its place once more as a German federal state. Whether such a prospect would be welcomed by the people was more doubtful. Although Luxemburg was regarded as a German State in the nineteenth century, before the French Revolution, the historical and political associations of the State were with Belgium—then the Austrian Netherlands—rather than with Germany. It was suggested in England that the Entente, in the event of their being victorious, should depose the Grand-Duchess owing to her pro-Germanism, or alleged pro-Germanism, and hand over the country to Belgium, but there is no reason to suppose that the Allied Governments proposed to refuse to allow a return to the *status quo ante bellum*.

In January there was a political crisis, and a change of Premiers, Herr Vannerus becoming Prime Minister; but all real authority was exercised by the German invaders.

III. THE NETHERLANDS.

In spite of the proximity of Holland to the Western Theatre of military operations, that country was able to maintain its neutrality throughout the year. Nor did any events occur to alter materially the sympathies of the Dutch people. Those sympathies remained predominantly with the Western Allies, and especially with Belgium. There was no likelihood that the Dutch would forget the oppression of their immediate neighbours, and even had they been inclined to do so, the attacks by German submarines upon Dutch shipping would have been a constant reminder of the unscrupulous character of German militarism. So far as there existed any pro-German sentiments in the country, these were to be found at the Royal Court and amongst the upper classes. Certain actions of the Entente Powers caused, however, a good deal of irritation and criticism in Holland. The efforts of Great Britain to control Dutch foreign trade with a view to completing the blockade of Germany caused certain classes of the people serious losses, and the resulting annoyance was intense, both on account of the actual losses incurred and also because the British action was deemed to go beyond the limits permitted by International Law, and was regarded as an unnecessary interference in the affairs of an independent nation. The treatment of Greece by France and Great Britain was also criticised in Holland, and tended to cool somewhat the feelings of friendship for those two Powers.

At the beginning of the year the Netherlands suffered severely from floods. A great storm arose in the middle of January, and the Zuider Zee became so rough that the dykes of

North Holland gave way in many places, and a large area was immediately inundated by the sea. Houses were flooded up to their roofs. The town of Broek was completely isolated by the waters. The floods continued for months, and at the end of February it was even feared that Amsterdam itself might be inundated.

Early in the year controversy arose with Great Britain over that country's seizure of neutral mails, a dispute precisely similar to the British-American controversy referred to elsewhere (see p. 323). The Dutch Government protested that the seizure of neutral mails was contrary to Article 9 of the Hague Convention of 1907, but the British Government replied that since the seizures had been made in British territorial waters they were not a violation of International Law. To this the Dutch Government replied that the vessels concerned were compelled to enter British territorial waters by the British mine-fields, and hence the seizures were really comparable to a similar action on the high seas, but that in any case the mails in question were not intended to be entrusted to the British postal authorities.

At the end of March a somewhat mysterious crisis arose in Dutch affairs, the Government evidently thinking that it was about to be even more difficult than heretofore to maintain Dutch neutrality. Special military precautions were suddenly taken and the granting of temporary furlough in the Army was stopped. Great anxiety prevailed in the country, and there were wild rumours that the Entente Powers had demanded from the Dutch Government permission to march through Dutch territory. The position was deemed so serious that at the beginning of April secret sessions of both Houses of Parliament were held, at which the Government made confidential communications to the assemblies. No definite information transpired on the cause of the crisis, but an official statement was issued declaring that the suspension of the granting of temporary furlough was a measure of precaution in connexion with the maintenance of Dutch neutrality; the measure, it was stated, was not a sequel to any existing political complications, but was due to circumstances which caused "apprehension of an increase of the dangers to which the country was exposed." The communiqué concluded by stating that "it is not in the interest of the country to give any information in regard to these circumstances."

During the year German submarines sank a considerable number of Dutch vessels on the excuse that they were cruising in the "war area" which the Imperial Government had proclaimed. The two most important ships sunk were the large liners *Tubantia* and *Palembang*, both of which were torpedoed in March, the former on the 16th, off the Noord Hinder Light-ship, and the latter on the 18th, off the North Galloper Buoy. The loss of life in these incidents was fortunately small.

Proposals to reclaim a part of the Zuider Zee were again discussed, and in the autumn a scheme, the cost of which was

estimated at 10,000,000*l.*, was definitely adopted by the Government. The work of recovering this land from the sea was expected to take fifteen years. The area which it was hoped to drain was about 500 square miles.

In opening the autumn session of Parliament on September 19, the Queen reaffirmed her determination to defend Dutch independence and rights against aggression from any quarter. The stores of arms and munitions had, said the Queen, been greatly increased.

Holland was not formally invited by President Wilson to co-operate in the peace movement in December.

IV. SWITZERLAND.

The position of this country in the great war, completely surrounded as it was by belligerent Powers, remained one of great difficulty. The Federal Government and the nation as a whole continued to be extremely anxious to maintain neutrality, though in their sympathies the Swiss people were more sharply divided than probably any other neutral nation in Europe. The German Cantons were, speaking generally, strongly favourable to Germany and Austria, whilst the French-Swiss were equally warmly on the side of the Entente.

This division of opinion became very obvious in the discussions which arose early in the year over an incident in which two colonels of the Swiss Intelligence Department were accused of having conveyed information to the Military Attachés of Germany and Austria-Hungary. The officers in question were Colonel Egli and Colonel von Wattenwyl, and they were prosecuted and tried before a high military court at Zurich. The trial was opened on February 28, and the charge against the two officers was "first, with having since the spring of 1915 communicated to two Military Attachés of one of the groups of belligerent Powers all or part of the Staff reports only open to a certain number of high officers and civil servants; and, secondly, with having communicated to a Military Attaché of the same group of belligerent Powers foreign documents exchanged between official persons abroad and between foreign official persons in Switzerland and their Government, the said documents having been deciphered by Dr. Langie."

The trial caused immense interest in Switzerland. Colonel Egli, in being examined by the presiding Judge, stated that at the outbreak of the war the Swiss Intelligence Department was in a parlous state, and therefore in order to obtain information he had gone to those who had information to give, namely, the Attachés of the Central Powers. In exchange for the information received, he had given the Attachés the "bulletin" of the Swiss General Staff, a document which was, he contended, neither strictly confidential nor specially important. The trial was prolonged over two days, and the chief witness called for the prosecution was Dr. Langie. It was on the strength of state-

ments made by the latter that the prosecution had originally been instituted. The evidence given by Dr. Langie was found to be contradictory in character, and his statements that foreign official telegrams which he had decoded had been communicated by the accused to the German and Austro-Hungarian Attachés appeared to rest upon surmise only. Moreover, his own reputation for integrity was not enhanced by his evidence, for it transpired that before he communicated his suspicions to the Swiss authorities he had already surreptitiously warned the Military Attaché of an Entente Power. Dr. Langie's explanation of this action only caused ridicule: he stated that "a violation of neutrality having been committed he wished to compensate for it by giving information to a foreign Legation." Colonel Sprecher, Chief of the General Staff, was also called as a witness. He said that he had been ignorant of the fact that the Staff bulletin was being used for the purpose of exchange, and that he considered this an improper act which made the officers concerned liable to disciplinary punishment. He said, however, that he was convinced that the two officers had been conscientiously acting solely in the interests of Switzerland, and he gave vent to the opinion that "if information were received of great value to us, I consider that the officers could, if they wished, have given in exchange something which might not be strictly compatible with neutrality." On the evening of February 29 the Court gave its verdict, the two colonels being acquitted. They were found not guilty on the second charge of communicating to the Austro-German Attachés the contents of the decoded telegrams, and in regard to the communication of the Staff bulletin, this was declared to be an improper but not a criminal act, and the officers were therefore merely sent before their military chiefs for disciplinary punishment.

Important debates took place in the Federal Parliament in March. At the beginning of the war special and very large powers had been given the Government, and some politicians had criticised the use which had been made of these powers, but after the matter had been thoroughly debated, Parliament decided by a large majority that it was necessary that this arrangement should continue.

Owing to the fact that the country was completely surrounded by belligerents, it suffered acutely from economic difficulties, being unable to obtain a sufficiency of food and raw materials. In order to alleviate this condition, negotiations were instituted with both groups of belligerent Powers, those with Germany and Austria-Hungary being the more successful. In September an Economic Convention was concluded with Germany, by the terms of which Germany supplied Switzerland with coal and coke and Switzerland supplied Germany with cattle, cheese, and aluminium.

On December 14 Parliament elected Herr Edmond Schulthess, of Aargau, to be President of the Confederation for 1917,

in succession to Herr C. Decoppet. Herr Schulthess was forty-eight years of age and had previously been Minister of Public Economy.

When the American President made his famous peace-move in December, the Swiss Government immediately associated itself with him, and sent a note to all the belligerent Powers urging upon them the desirability of an early peace, and offering to take any action which might lead to the establishment of a lasting peace.

The greater part of the Army was kept mobilised throughout the year.

V. SPAIN.

The entry of Italy into the great war in the middle of 1915 left Spain by far the largest and most important neutral country in Europe. Whilst the six Great Powers were slaughtering their manhood and plunging into appalling debt, the Spanish nation continued on its way undisturbed by the sound of the distant storm. King Alfonso's Government had throughout preserved most strict and impartial neutrality, and by the geographical position of the country, it was naturally less liable to be involved in any incidental complications than any of the minor neutrals. Spain was not surrounded by warring armies like Switzerland and Rumania, and it was not harassed by the British blockade like Holland and the Scandinavian countries. The Spaniards were able to develop in perfect peace their large friendly and commercial relations with the New World, and the necessary consequence was that they were coming to occupy a position of relatively greater importance and prosperity in the stricken and impoverished continent.

At the end of 1915 there had been a change of Government, the Conservatives being succeeded by the Liberals, but since the Conservatives still possessed a majority in the Parliament, a general election became necessary. The King therefore dissolved Parliament in March, and the polling for the contested seats was fixed for April 9. The result was a striking victory for the New Prime Minister, Count de Romanones. The Liberals secured 236 seats in the Congress which gave them a clear majority over all the other parties combined. The other parties were represented as follows: Conservatives, 112; Regionalists, 14; Carlists, 9; Reformists, 14; Republicans, 19; Independents, 8. It will be remembered that the Spanish Senate is partly elective, and the state of parties in this House after the elections in April was as follows: Liberals, 177; Conservatives, 133; Regionalists, 7; Carlists, 4; Democrats and Reformists, 7; Republicans, 1; Independents, 14.

It will be seen that in both Houses of Parliament the two great central parties, the Conservatives and Liberals, completely dominated the situation, the extreme Right (the Carlists and Regionalists) and the extreme Left both being very weak numer-

ically. This state of things was a guarantee of stability, and moderation continued to be the prevailing tendency in Spanish politics.

The King opened the new Parliament on May 10, and in his speech from the Throne he referred to the international position as follows: "My Government will observe the same strict neutrality as was followed by its predecessors in office. The war will be remembered with horror by future generations, but the unprecedented sacrifices and valour exhibited by the belligerent nations will fill posterity with admiration. I earnestly desire to find an opportunity which might enable me to hasten the approach of the hour of peace." Amongst the domestic measures forecasted in the King's speech was one for proceeding more actively with public works, and another for introducing certain financial reforms rendered necessary by the reactions of the war.

The Budget for 1916 showed a considerable anticipated deficit, the estimated revenue being 51,221,000*l.* and the estimated expenditure 58,602,000*l.* The expenditure on armaments, both naval and military, was only 8,400,000*l.*, that is, approximately equal to the Italian war expenditure for one week.

In the middle of July there was a general strike on the Northern Railway, which caused some anxiety for several days, but after about ten days a satisfactory settlement was reached, and the men being contented with the terms offered them, returned to work without creating any serious disturbances.

In the autumn, various districts, especially in Valencia, suffered much from floods, huge areas being inundated, and thousands of families being rendered homeless and destitute.

At the end of December, when the President of the United States made his great attempt to induce the belligerents to terminate the war and come to terms with one another, and appealed to the European neutrals, including Spain, to co-operate with him in this attempt, the Spanish Government adopted a different line of action from that taken by the Governments of the Teutonic neutrals. Count Romanones made it known that in his view all attempts at mediation at that time would be useless and inopportune, and could scarcely be regarded as truly impartial, since mediation in the circumstances then existing would favour one group of belligerents at the expense of the other group. The formal reply of the Spanish Government to President Wilson's note was published on December 30. The reply stated that the desire of the United States Government that his Majesty's Government should make a *démarche* to the belligerents in support of the attitude adopted by the American Government was reasonable, but that since the impressions produced by the President's note to the belligerents had now become known, the Spanish Government did not consider that such a *démarche* could be effective. His Majesty's Government would not, however, refuse at a more auspicious moment

in the future to join in a movement for mediation, supposing that at that moment there was reason to think that intervention would have good results.

VI. PORTUGAL.

Whilst the greater of the two Iberian States was thus happily outside the conflict which was ravaging Europe, the minor nation became involved in the conflagration. Portugal became at war with the Central Powers owing to her alliance with Great Britain, the small country having been an ally of England for no less than five and a half centuries. Throughout 1915 the hostility between Germany and Portugal had been informal, and although fighting had taken place between troops of the two nations in Africa, there had been no formal declaration of war; and indeed the German Government had appeared somewhat anxious to explain away the incidents which had occurred in the colonies. On February 23, however, the Portuguese Government seized all the German ships in Portuguese ports, and after this act of war it was of course impossible for the German Government any longer to affect to ignore the real state of things. On March 9 the German Government declared war upon Portugal, and this of course also necessitated war between Portugal and Austria-Hungary. The German Minister in Lisbon gave a note to the Foreign Minister which set out a series of German grievances against Portugal, ending with the above-mentioned seizure of German vessels, and also contained the formal declaration of war.

At a joint session of both Houses of Parliament on March 10, Senhor Costa, the Prime Minister, made a statement on the severance of relations with Germany, and declared that all the obligations of the alliance with Great Britain would be carried out. He also informed Parliament that the Government had resigned, as they deemed it desirable under the new conditions that Portugal should be governed by a "national" Ministry, representative of all the republican parties. The negotiations between the different parties on the subject of the new Cabinet did not progress very smoothly, as some of the politicians concerned wished to see Monarchists and Clericals included in the new Ministry. Eventually, however, a Government was formed of the republican parties under the Premiership of Dr. Almeida, and including Dr. Costa and Senhor Soares. There were, however, frequent ministerial changes during the year.

Portugal assisted in the campaign in East Africa, but up to the end of the year she had played no part in the main struggle in France. At the end of the year a small force was sent to Salonika. Parliament voted 17,000,000*l.* for war purposes. It was necessary to raise this sum by loan, more particularly as the ordinary Budget for 1916-17 was estimated to leave a serious deficit, the revenue being estimated at 12,026,000*l.* and the expenditure at 16,880,000*l.*

VII. DENMARK.

This small nation remained neutral in the great war. The sympathies of the people, as in Holland and Norway, were mainly with the Entente. This was due to the fact that the Danes were a free and democratic people, and consequently had natural affinities with the French and British, as well as with the unfortunate Belgians, and was also due to the memories of the seizure of Schleswig-Holstein in 1864.

From March 9 to 11 a joint conference of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian Cabinet Ministers was held in Copenhagen, to decide certain matters connected with the maintenance of Scandinavian neutrality. The Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of each of the three countries attended the conference. Very little transpired of the exact nature of the discussions, and the official statement on the conference which was issued in Copenhagen on March 11 was very vague in its terms. This memorandum merely informed the public that various questions which had occupied the Governments of the Scandinavian States since the meeting of the three kings at Malmö in December, 1914, were debated, and that the conference had strengthened the good relations between the states and had given a new proof of the intention of the Scandinavian Governments to preserve impartial neutrality. The conference was gratifying to the Entente Powers, by reason of the fact that it was evidence of the Swedish Government's desire to co-operate with Denmark and Norway, and hence implied that that Government proposed to remain strictly neutral, since nobody had seriously suggested that there existed the smallest likelihood that either Denmark or Norway would cease to be neutral.

The Danish Budget estimates for the financial year 1916-17 showed that an excess of revenue over expenditure was anticipated. The estimated expenditure was 7,618,485*l.*, and the estimated revenue was 8,374,940*l.* The estimated expenditure on the Army and Navy was approximately 1,529,400*l.*

During the latter half of the year the politics of the country were dominated by the question of the sale of the Danish West Indian islands to the United States. It was announced in July that the Danish Government had concluded a treaty with the American Government authorising the sale of these islands, the treaty to be subject, however, to ratification by Congress and by the Rigsdag. The sale of the three Danish islands of St. Croix, St. Thomas, and St. John to the United States had been proposed before on more than one occasion, but the opposition in Denmark had hitherto been too powerful to admit of the sale. On this occasion, also, much hostility to the proposal was manifested, chiefly amongst Conservatives. The terms of the draft treaty were that the United States should pay 5,000,000*l.* for the islands and should acknowledge Danish sovereignty over the whole of Greenland. Owing to the op-

position to the scheme in both Houses of Parliament, the Government proposed that a plebiscite on the question should be held, and the Rigsdag accepted this suggestion. Every person who was an elector under the new Constitution as established in the previous year was to have the right to vote in this referendum, women thus being entitled to vote. Certain politicians suggested that a general election, should be held on the ground that the present Parliament had been elected under the old Constitution, which was much less democratic than the new Constitution, but the King and the Cabinet were opposed to an election in the existing circumstances in Europe, and ultimately it was agreed to postpone the elections, but to form a Coalition Ministry and hold the proposed referendum. A Conservative, a Liberal, and a Socialist therefore entered the Radical Cabinet of Mr. Zahle at the end of September, and the plebiscite was fixed for December 14. The new Socialist Minister was Mr. Stauning, leader of the Social-Democrats in the Folkething. The referendum was duly held on December 14, and the result was favourable to the proposed sale, by 283,694 votes against 157,596. The Bill authorising the sale was then reintroduced in the Rigsdag and passed both Houses, in spite of the strong opposition of the Conservatives in the Landsting. The Bill was passed by the Folkething by 90 votes to 16, and by the Landsting by 40 votes to 19. It should be added that Congress had already approved of the purchase.

VIII. SWEDEN.

Throughout the year this fortunate nation was able to maintain its neutrality in the great war. The course of events brought about controversies with both groups of belligerents, especially with the Allied Powers, but at no time was there any really serious danger that these controversies would involve the country in the conflict. The sympathies of Sweden remained, on the whole, favourable to Germany, but here as elsewhere there were naturally differences of opinion. The Court, the upper classes, the universities, and, in politics, the Conservative Party, were almost entirely Germanophil in sentiment. A group of persons known as "Activists," mostly Conservatives, desired to take "active" measures to give expression to these views, that is, to enter the war on the side of Germany and endeavour to reconquer Finland. This propaganda had considerable support amongst the nobility and among officers of the Army, but it was condemned by many influential leaders of the Conservative Party, and was strongly opposed by Liberals and Socialists. The Germanophil Party was no doubt very large, but the number of those who wished to give active expression to such sentiments was not great.

The reasons for this attitude were not far to seek. The enmity between Sweden and Russia was traditional. It should

be remembered that in a political sense there were two wars in Europe rather than one. In the West the Monarchies of Central Europe were striving against the three great Liberal democracies of Western Europe, but in the East the Central Monarchies were opposing the aggrandisement of almost completely despotic Russia. Now owing to the history and geographical position of Sweden, it was the Eastern rather than the Western war, and the Eastern political issues more than the Western issues, which loomed large in the eyes of Swedes. Their attitude was not due to any intrinsic antagonism towards France and Britain; quite the contrary, for Sweden was a much more democratic country than Germany. But Finland they knew, and thinking of Poland as another Finland, they regarded the Austro-German forces as armies of liberation. And in their enmity and mistrust of Russia, they saw what was evil in her, rather than what was good. They saw the tyrannical figure of historic Tsarism, and ignored what Western democrats regarded as the new-born hope of a Liberal Russia, as represented by the Progressive Bloc in the Duma.

Thus the Swedes were more Russophobe than Germanophil, though the latter sentiment did exist. It must not be forgotten that Teutonism, like Slavism (and much more than Latinism) was a binding force in Europe; and in race and character and culture the Swedes were entirely Teutonic.¹ The affinity between the University-worlds of Germany and Sweden was notorious.

Amongst Liberals and Socialists, however, these sentiments were much less prevalent. The Socialists in particular, though not pro-Entente, were completely neutralist in feeling. They thought of Belgium as well as of Finland and Poland. To them the Russian Tsar might be a villain of the piece, but the Prussian King was not much better; and they regarded both groups of belligerents as grossly militarist and unscrupulous. Needless to add, there were many individuals who were positively sympathetic to France and Great Britain.

The Riksdag was opened on January 17, and the King in his speech from the Throne referred to the belligerents in very frank language. He said:—

“The Government earnestly hopes to be able always to maintain that neutrality which it decided to observe from the beginning of the war. In order to maintain neutrality and Swedish national sovereignty increased forces by land and sea must always be kept in readiness. The Swedish people have felt the effects of the war in numerous ways during the past year. The belligerents have neglected in an ever-increasing degree the written

¹ It is of interest to recall in this connexion that prior to the recent estrangement between Germany and England, which began after the retirement of the Marquess of Salisbury, it was often argued in both countries, but especially in Germany, that on the ground of common Teutonism friendship between the two nations was natural and right.

International Laws designed for the protection of neutrals and for limiting the violence of war. . . . Sweden had assisted in drawing up the laws, and had taken measures for the observance of the duty of neutrals, largely in co-operation with the other two Scandinavian nations. . . . The difficulties caused to Swedish economic life by the attitude of the belligerent Powers have been considerable. The Government has more than once been obliged to intervene against attempts to put Sweden's industrial and commercial life under the usurped control of another Power. The work for the increase of the national defences ought to be continued. In spite of rigid economy in the drafting of the Budget, new taxes would be necessary."

The passage in this speech mentioning "the usurped control of another Power" was of course a reference to Great Britain, and that such a statement should have been made on so formal an occasion was a clear indication of the somewhat strained relations then existing between the British and Swedish Governments. The root of the trouble was, of course, the British attempt to starve Germany into submission, an attempt which encountered from the first the formidable geographical difficulty that Germany was flanked on several sides by small neutral nations. The applications of International Law to this peculiar position were extremely vague, the situation being in fact unprecedented. It was obvious, of course, that to blockade the neutrals, as well as the German coasts, would have been an act of war, whilst on the other hand, if the neutrals continued to import goods (other than contraband of war consigned to Germany which the British were clearly justified in seizing), the effects of the blockade would be almost completely nullified. The dilemma seemed complete, for on the face of the matter it appeared that a neutral state was, as such, entitled to import and export what it pleased. The British Foreign Office was therefore faced with an extremely difficult task, but after an immense amount of trouble and the lapse of many months (which was, however, inevitable unless the small Teutonic neutrals were to be forced into the war on the side of the Central Powers) agreements were reached with Holland and Denmark by which, in a general sense, those countries imported what they needed for their own consumption, but the flow of goods going through to Germany was stopped. But the negotiations for a similar agreement with Sweden broke down, the Swedish Government standing out for the country's extreme rights as a neutral, and thus thwarting the British blockade. Hence arose the passages in the King's speech to which reference has been made.

A week later, on January 24, an important debate on the King's speech took place in the Lower House of the Diet. Mr. Eden, the leader of the Liberals, and Mr. Branting, the leader of the Socialists, both stated that they feared that a new form of Activism was appearing, by which many Swedes were being allowed to give to Germany by commercial means that assist-

ance which they could not give by actual military co-operation. To these allegations the Prime Minister, Mr. Hammarskjöld, made a long reply. He said that the King and the Government had repeatedly made it plain that they desired to maintain peace, though they reckoned with the possibility that circumstances might arise which would force Sweden into war. He then spoke at length of the violations of International Law by belligerents, which, he said, the belligerents themselves might in the future, under other circumstances, greatly regret. "It must be admitted that we might have mitigated for the time being certain inconveniences, especially in the matter of industry, if we had been less scrupulous regarding absolute and impartial neutrality. These mitigations would, however, only have been useful to us for the moment. Experience shows us that in view of the perpetual and rapid aggravation of the commercial war one can often depend for a short time only on the precarious enjoyment of the advantages secured by a comprehensive arrangement. Other neutral countries have also had the experience that concessions only give rise to fresh demands. When one enters on the road of concessions, one easily gets further and further away from real neutrality." "There is," continued the Premier, "a risk that the dangerous restrictions of our rights and liberties, should we submit to them, would remain in an acute form until the end of the war, and even after the war, and that they would have the definite result of placing us in a state of dependence, which would be both economically and politically painful. Although in the interest of neutrality and independence the Government have renounced certain temporary benefits, the aggregate result upon our industrial life has not been to place us in a worse position than other countries, but rather the contrary."

At the end of February a Neutral Peace Conference, which was organised by the American pacifist, Mr. Ford, met in Stockholm. The objects of this conference were defined by the secretary, Mr. Lochner, under four heads, as follows:—

1. To appeal to neutral Governments to summon an official neutral conference.
2. To request the belligerent Governments to allow experts from their countries who were invited to take part in the present conference to go to Stockholm without passport difficulties.
3. To request all the belligerents to state the precise objects for which they were fighting.
4. To enlighten the public generally through the Press on the subject of the war and the cause of peace.

No immediate success attended the efforts of the pacifist agitators, but in December they had the satisfaction of seeing their third point emphasised by President Wilson.

During May the Russophobe sentiments became even more intense, owing to reports that the Russians were making military preparations on the Aland Islands, which had hitherto re-

remained unfortified. Russian statements that the preparations were directed against Germany not against Sweden did not suffice to calm the agitation completely.

In July when the British and French Governments denounced the Declaration of London, the Swedish Government, in co-operation with the Danish and Norwegian Ministries, formally declared that in their opinion the new rules of maritime warfare which Great Britain proposed to follow did not conform in several essential respects to the recognised principles of International Law, and that therefore they (the Scandinavian Governments) reserved the right to make demands and claims which might arise from the application of the new rules.

Throughout the year there was incessant controversy between Sweden and Great Britain in reference to points which arose owing to the British blockade of Germany, and in particular there was a sharp disagreement over the seizure by Great Britain of neutral mails. The discussion proceeded on similar lines to that between America and Great Britain on the same question, and many of the points raised by Sweden were identical with those urged by the United States. In retaliation for what they regarded as the violations of International Law by the British, the Swedes seized British parcels in transit to Russia at the beginning of the year, and these were not released until six months later.

During August and September further controversy with the Entente arose over the question of the navigation of Swedish waters, recent Swedish decrees closing the Kogrund Passage to foreign ships having rendered entrance into and exit from the Baltic difficult or actually impossible for Entente ships. The Swedish decrees were not withdrawn.

In September Swedish Ministers took part in the Scandinavian Conference at Christiania (see Norway).

In the Budget for 1916-17, which was passed early in the year, revenue and expenditure were estimated to balance at 23,014,000*l*. The Army estimates amounted to 3,670,000*l*. and the anticipated expenditure on the Navy to 1,715,000*l*.

The elections for one-sixth of the members of the Senate, that is, 25 members, took place as usual in September. The Socialists gained two seats from the Liberals, the strength of the Conservatives remaining unchanged.

The American President's peace-note in December was immediately supported by the Swedish Government. Mr. Hammarskjöld first sent a very prompt note on behalf of Sweden alone to all the belligerents urging the adoption of the President's suggestion, and then about a week later a joint note to the same effect was sent by all the Scandinavian Governments.

IX. NORWAY.

Norway remained neutral in the European War. The sympathies of the people continued to be favourable to the Entente,

especially, of course, to Belgium, but this was perhaps somewhat less marked than in Denmark. Norway had no memories comparable to the Danish feelings about Schleswig-Holstein, but on the contrary shared, though in a much milder degree, the Swedish dislike of Russia.

As stated elsewhere (see Denmark) the Norwegian Premier and Foreign Minister attended the important Scandinavian Conference at Copenhagen in March, and Mr. Knudsen, the Prime Minister, announced his satisfaction with the results of that meeting, and stated in the Storting on March 15, that the three Governments had agreed at Copenhagen to take the necessary measures to guard the independence of the Scandinavian countries in the economic struggle which was expected to follow the war.

The Norwegian Budget for the year ending June 30, 1916, balanced at 10,057,250*l*. The expenditure on the Army and Navy amounted to approximately 2,023,990*l*.

An important reform was carried in Parliament in the shape of a Bill amending the Constitution in such a way as to make women eligible to become members of the Cabinet. Norway thus reached the extreme limit of the principle of political equality between men and women.

A second meeting of Scandinavian Ministers took place in September, this time in Christiania. An official communiqué was issued in the Norwegian capital on September 22, explaining the work of this Conference. It was stated that the object was to attain still closer co-operation between the three kingdoms in the difficult task of maintaining their rights as neutrals. Special attention had been given to the destruction and detention of neutral ships and to the "Black Lists" issued by belligerent Powers. The Scandinavian Ministers had also arrived at the conclusion that there could be no question of the Northern Kingdoms, either alone or in common with other neutral countries, taking the initiative in any mediation between the belligerent Powers.

On October 13 a decree was issued forbidding submarine warships from entering Norwegian waters, except under stress of weather. Both groups of belligerents protested against this decree, but the Norse Government refused to alter their decision.

During the year, and especially during the later months, a large number of Norwegian vessels were sunk on one pretext or another by German submarines. Much indignation was caused by these incidents, and in the autumn the Government entered into a controversy with Berlin on the matter, but Norway was unable to secure any serious modification in the ruthless German methods of maritime warfare.

CHAPTER V.

SOUTHERN ASIA.

I. CYPRUS.

THIS island passed through the year without any important changes, political or economic. The chief trouble of the people was the prevalence of locusts, these insects again doing a large amount of damage to the crops. The vital statistics relating to the country for the year 1915 showed that the Cypriote birth-rate was unusually low for an Oriental land. The number of births in that year was 9,141, which is equivalent to a rate of only 31 per thousand. Fortunately, however, the death-rate was also low. The total number of deaths was 5,473, which represented a death-rate of 18·5 per thousand.

The figures of the Budget for the financial year 1915-16 were of a highly satisfactory character. The total revenue, including the Imperial Grant-in-Aid of 50,000*l.*, was 413,692*l.*, which provided a surplus over the expenditure of no less than 26,574*l.*, the total expenditure thus being 387,118*l.* Of this expenditure 92,800*l.* represented the Cypriote share of the Ottoman debt. The revenue was the highest ever recorded since the British occupation of the island, and exceeded that of the previous year by over 73,000*l.* This increase was chiefly due to the high prices obtained for the State tithe-grain and to the excellent sales of State timber.

A general election for the Legislative Council was held in October, but this brought about no important political changes.

II. PERSIA.

The fate of Persia during the war was that of several other weak neutral countries; a large part of its territory was overrun by the armed hosts of its belligerent neighbours. It will be remembered that at the commencement of the war the Shah's Government had declared its neutrality, but the neutral rights of the State were respected by neither Russia nor Turkey. Throughout 1915 the north-western region of Persia had been the scene of constant fighting between the Russians and the Turks, and this state of affairs continued unaltered during 1916. The Shah's authority was reduced almost to a shadow. By a Russo-British agreement the country was divided into a Russian sphere and a British sphere, and as time went by these spheres gradually took on more and more of the character of protectorates. Although the Teheran Government was neutral, the sympathies of the people were mainly with Turkey, and the Turkish army was aided by bands of Persian tribesmen. The Persians knew nothing of and cared nothing for Germany, but in their capacity as Moslems, they sympathised with their co-

religionists of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, what were considered aggressions by the Russians in northern Persia, both before and during the war, caused intense resentment, and the British, as allies of the Russians, were also disliked.

The fighting between the Russians and the Turks was of an indecisive character, and the successes of the two armies alternated with remarkable regularity. The armies operating in this region were not large. The Russian force was based upon Tabriz, and consisted of 40,000 men under the command of General Baratoff. The Turkish army was probably somewhat smaller, and its base was at Bagdad, over two hundred miles from Kermanshah, but it had the advantage of operating in a friendly country. In January the Turks advanced and took Kermanshah, but two months later General Baratoff recaptured the town, and pressing rapidly onwards reached Ispahan before the end of March. This town is situated on what was regarded as the southern boundary of the Russian sphere. The Russians advanced westwards as far as the Turkish frontier, but the Turks were reinforced after the fall of Kut, and in June they won a victory and drove Baratoff's force back a considerable distance, nearly as far as Hamadan. In June and July the Turks were joined by large numbers of Persian irregular cavalry, and the Russians finding their communications threatened were compelled to abandon Hamadan and the surrounding country. Up to the end of the year the Turks maintained their hold on this part of Persian territory.

During the year the British began to organise a force of gendarmerie for southern Persia, General Sir Percy Sykes being placed in command. In those parts of northern Persia which were not actually the scene of military operations—that is, in the north-eastern districts—the Russians established a similar force of military police.

Changes occurred in the personnel of the Teheran Government, Sipah Salar becoming Premier in place of Prince Firman Firma, and M. Heinsens, a Belgian, being appointed Treasurer-General, on the advice of the two dominant Powers.

III. AFGHANISTAN.

The Amir of Afghanistan maintained his neutrality in the great war, and the principality did not become involved in the troubles of Persia. At the end of 1916 information was published concerning a German mission sent to Afghanistan in the previous year. It appears that the Emperor William had sent a German officer, Lieutenant von Hentig, accompanied by certain Indian revolutionaries who had resided in Berlin, on a mission to the Amir, with the object of inducing him to attack India. The members of the mission had succeeded in making their way through Persia, by breaking up into small parties, and they had remained in Afghanistan nearly a year. Nevertheless,

Imperial Expenditure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	£54,599,800
Provincial Expenditure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,912,800
Total Expenditure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>£85,512,100</u>

From this total expenditure the sum of 364,900*l.* had to be deducted on account of moneys once more withdrawn from Provincial balances, and thus the total expenditure to be met out of revenue was 85,147,200*l.* Thus a small surplus was anticipated for the year 1916-17. Expenditure was restricted in all directions, but the economies on education were to be less severe than in the previous year, and increased expenditure on police had become necessary in some provinces. The expenditure on the Army was estimated at 23,000,000*l.*

The Budget provided for additional taxation under several heads—salt, income, excise, and customs. In regard to the increased income tax, this did not affect incomes below Rs. 5,000 a year,¹ on which the rate remained at 5 pies per rupee, but above this income there were new rates, as follows :—

On incomes of Rs. 5,000 to 9,999	-	-	-	-	6 pies per rupee
" " 10,000 to 24,999	-	-	-	-	9 pies " "
" " 25,000 upwards	-	-	-	-	1 anna " "

This graduated income tax was a new feature, the rate of 5 pies having been general previously. The income tax could not be regarded as heavy, since the maximum rate now instituted was equivalent to only 1*s.* 3*d.* in the pound. In regard to customs, export duties were imposed upon jute and tea, which were expected to yield nearly 900,000*l.*, and there were various increases in import duties. The jute industry had been extremely prosperous during the war. The general import duty was raised from 5 per cent. *ad valorem* to 7½ per cent.

The Indian Empire was saved from the effects of the world-shortage of wheat by judicious State interference. The reader may remember that during the previous year the Indian Government had instituted a State monopoly of the export of Indian wheat in order to protect the Indian consumer from the effects of the shortage in other parts of the world, and the Government had been so successful in this that the prices ruling in India were roughly about twenty shillings lower than those ruling in England. This scheme was originally arranged to terminate on March 31, 1916, but in February it was announced that it would be continued indefinitely. The Government stated that after allowing for the normal consumption in India about two thousand tons of Indian wheat would be available per annum for export. In this way it came about that there was no shortage of bread in India.

In March an announcement of considerable interest to the poorer classes of the Indian population was made. On March 20 the Viceroy announced in the Legislative Council that the

¹ Incomes below Rs. 1,000 paid no income tax.

system of Indian Indentured Labour would be abolished. This system of indenturing Indian coolies to work as labourers outside India had been instituted in 1842, but it had been always looked upon with disfavour in many quarters, and it had been subjected by the Indian authorities to various regulations and restrictions. In fact, the only non-British possessions to which Indians were permitted to emigrate as indentured labourers in recent years was Dutch Guiana. Emigration under these conditions was, however, permitted to various British Colonies, such as Jamaica, Trinidad, Fiji, and especially British Guiana. The Viceroy stated that although the policy of total abolition had been accepted, the measure could not be put in force immediately, as a transition period would be necessary in order not to upset unduly the affairs of the Colonies which were dependent on this class of labour. The Governor-General pointed out that the system had been abhorred in India, and that "educated Indians looked upon it as a badge of helotry." It had been reported that the smallness of the number of women accompanying the emigrants had been a fruitful cause of a great deal of social degeneration. Lord Hardinge closed his speech by stating that it was a cause of great satisfaction to himself that one of his last official acts in India should be to abolish a system of which he disapproved as heartily as the critics among the educated classes of India.

On March 25 in closing the Budget debate, Lord Hardinge made his last speech in the Legislative Council. In reviewing the past year he stated that the relations with the Persian Government remained most friendly, and that the Amir of Afghanistan had recently renewed his previous promise of neutrality in the great war. In the external affairs of India, nothing worse than a few petty tribal raids was to be feared, but in Bengal a large and regrettable number of cases of dacoities had recently occurred. The most important part of the speech referred, however, to the political development of Hindustan itself. On this point Lord Hardinge said: "During the past few months I have seen mention made in speeches at meetings in the country and in the press of self-government, colonial self-government, and Home Rule for India. I have often wondered whether those speakers and writers fully realise the conditions prevailing in the Dominions, such as Canada and Australia, which render self-government possible. I do not for a moment wish to discountenance self-government for India as a national ideal. It is a perfectly legitimate aspiration and has the warm sympathy of all moderate men, but in the present position of India it is not idealism that is needed but practical politics. We should do our utmost to grapple with realities, and lightly to raise extravagant hopes and encourage unrealisable demands can only tend to delay and will not accelerate political progress. I know this is the sentiment of wise and thoughtful Indians. Nobody is more anxious than I

am to see the early realisation of the legitimate aspirations of India, but I am equally desirous of avoiding all danger of reaction from the birth of institutions which experience might prove to be premature." The speaker pointed to decentralisation, the endowing of provincial governments with greater powers, as the line along which political progress could be best achieved in the near future. Touching the question of Indian immigration into British Dominions, the Viceroy said that some modification of colonial policy might be expected in the future, but that notwithstanding this Indians would do well to realise that the Dominions held strong ideas on autonomy and were masters in their own houses. The Viceroy then took farewell of the Council.

This speech was notable as containing the ideas of one of the greatest of India's Viceroys on the most important problems of Indian politics.

Lord Hardinge's term of power, which it will be remembered had been specially prolonged, closed a few days later, and the new Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, arrived at Bombay on April 4.

An extremely disagreeable sensation was caused in June by the death from heat-stroke of a number of Territorial soldiers newly arrived in India, the circumstances being such as to throw grave responsibility upon the high officers concerned in the matter. On June 5, 13 Territorial officers with 1,013 men, who had only just landed from the transport *Ballarat*, were sent by train from Karachi to Lahore. The district crossed in this journey is notoriously one of the hottest in all India, and the occurrence took place, as already stated, during the hot season of the year. During the journey to Lahore, no fewer than fifty cases of heat-stroke occurred, and twelve of these proved fatal. The action of the authorities in sending unacclimatised troops upon such a journey as this, and evidently provided with insufficient accommodation, was stigmatised in some quarters as carelessness and negligence.

On September 7 the new Viceroy presided at the opening of the session of the Imperial Legislative Council, and made a speech of considerable general interest. Lord Chelmsford said that the Government were asking the Council to assist in the Government's efforts to check the secret intrigues of the enemy in India and to eradicate the taint of German and Austro-Hungarian influence in the trade of the sub-continent. The Government were hoping to develop in many ways the trade of the Indian Empire, and they were carefully studying the question of trade after the war. At the Imperial Conference, India would be represented and consulted with other parts of the Empire. Referring to the proposed scheme of sending Indian labourers to the Colonies, the Viceroy said that this scheme ought to be approached with caution. No uncontrolled recruiting of labourers would be allowed, and coolies would not be permitted to leave India without proper protection and proper safeguards.

The Government were endeavouring to devise a plan for recruiting in India under wholesome conditions and for securing proper treatment of the Indians in the country of destination, the proposed terms of engagement to be similar to those in force in the Malay Peninsula. Continuing, Lord Chelmsford said that the relations of the Government of India with both Afghanistan and Persia were very cordial and friendly. Calm had also prevailed in recent months among the tribes of the North-west frontier. In Bengal political dacoities had unfortunately been somewhat numerous, but the police force had been strengthened in this province. The speaker then dealt with the war, more particularly with the Mesopotamian campaign. In reference to this latter matter, he said that critics should remember that India had undertaken very considerable military responsibilities, having sent troops and supplies to Egypt, East Africa, and Aden, as well as originally to France. Over 2,600 combatant officers had been withdrawn from India, and in regard to the Indian Army, the number of recruits secured in the past two years exceeding the total strength of the Indian Army at the outbreak of war. The 2,600 officers withdrawn did not include the officers who proceeded on service with their own regiments. In order to make good the deficiency thus caused the Indian Army Reserve of Officers had been raised from its pre-war total of 40 to 2,000. The Viceroy also stated, in reference to India's contribution to the Medical Service, that there were now serving overseas 40 field ambulances, 6 clearing hospitals, 35 stationary hospitals, and 18 general hospitals. The personnel provided amounted to 258 officers of the R.A.M.C., 704 Indian Medical Service officers, 40 lady nurses, 475 assistant surgeons, 854 sub-assistant surgeons, 724 British nursing orderlies, 2,843 Indian ranks, and nearly 20,000 followers. The work of the Royal Indian Marine had also been of importance. About 170 vessels had been chartered and fitted up as transports, and 78 steamers, 120 launches, and over 200 barges and lighters were being utilised in Mesopotamia, where also 192 officers and 7,000 Indian seamen and stokers were serving. India had also taken some part in the manufacture of munitions. Finally, the Native States had rendered, said the Viceroy, "invaluable assistance." Imperial Service Troops were being employed upon various fronts, the Mysore Lancers and Bikaner Camel Corps being in Egypt, the Kashmir Rifles, Jind Infantry, and Fairdkot Sappers in East Africa, and the Maler Kotla Sappers in Mesopotamia. Lord Chelmsford closed his speech by declaring that this was "a record of loyal achievement of which India might indeed be proud."

During the year there were important developments in that progress towards political consciousness on the part of the educated and so-called "Westernised" section of the Indian population, which had been such a notable feature in Indian history in recent years. The claims of the Constitu-

tional wing of the Indian Progressives, as distinct from the violent aims of the revolutionary and largely Anarchist wing, were crystallised in a notable memorandum which was presented to the Viceroy in October by nineteen of the twenty-seven elected members of the Imperial Legislative Council. The preamble to this note stated that Indians at present suffered from great and galling disabilities, and that what was required was "not merely good government or efficient administration, but government that is acceptable to the people because it is responsible to them." Then followed a series of suggestions for reform; it was claimed that in all Executive Councils half the members should be Indians, that in all Legislative Councils a substantial majority of the members should be elected; that fiscal autonomy should be granted to India; that India's place in any scheme of Imperial federation should be similar to that of the self-governing Dominions; that the powers of the provincial governments should be largely increased; that Indians should, like Europeans, have the right to bear arms, and should be allowed to enlist as volunteers in a Territorial Army; and that the only subjects withheld from the purview of the Supreme Government of Hindustan should be the making of treaties other than commercial, the direction of military affairs, and foreign relations generally.

Of the nineteen members who signed this memorandum, twelve were Hindus, five Mahomedans, and two Parsees.

It should be added, however, that this memorandum was criticised by certain of the non-Brahmin classes in India, who held that the proposals were calculated to undermine the authority of the British rulers in India, who "in the existing circumstances of India were alone able to hold the scales evenly between creeds and classes."

For the greater part of the year, all the frontier tribes remained quiescent, but in November the Mohmands, who had given trouble in 1915, again made a raid into Indian territory. An army of 6,000 men of this tribe assembled opposite the town of Shabkadar, near Peshawar, and on November 16 an action was fought with the British troops, the latter using aeroplanes for the first time in Indian warfare. The Mohmands were driven back and scattered, and appear to have been much impressed by the aeroplanes. They were reported to have lost nearly 100 men killed. The British casualties were one man killed and ten wounded.

V. CEYLON.

This Colony passed through a quiet year, and there was no fresh outbreak of the fighting between the Moslem and non-Moslem elements of the population which had been so serious in the previous year. Full details were published regarding those disturbances which occurred in May, 1915 (see A.R., 1915,

p. 294). Over 100 persons were killed in these riots, thirty-nine being murdered by the Singalese rioters, and sixty-three being killed by the police and troops during the suppression of the rising. Nearly 9,000 persons were arrested during the period of martial law, and 4,855 were convicted. The damage done to property amounted to 6,000,000 rupees.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FAR EAST: CHINA—JAPAN.

I. CHINA.

THE historian who is himself a European is apt to think of human history almost exclusively in terms of Europeanism, and in considering a year which saw a great part of the world convulsed with war owing to the internecine dissensions of Europe, he is liable to think of little else but that war. Yet from a more detached point of view it was a notable fact that the largest community in the world stood outside the conflict and was almost entirely unaffected by it. Four hundred millions of Chinese pursued their ordinary avocations and lived their lives as though Fate had placed them on a different planet from that of the bellicose nations of Europe.

Yet the year was not an uneventful one for the teeming millions of yellow men. It will be remembered that at the end of 1915 Yuan-Shih-Kai, the President of the youthful Chinese Republic, had consented to become Emperor of a restored Chinese monarchy, after having been petitioned to do so by representatives of all the provinces. The voting for the restoration of the monarchy had not, of course, been anything in the nature of a democratic plebiscite, and it had, in fact, been suspected that the voting had been influenced greatly by the governing officials. However that may have been, it soon transpired that the proposed change was by no means universally popular, and at the end of December, 1915, a serious revolt against Yuan-Shih-Kai's authority broke out in the province of Yunnan, and on December 26 that province declared its independence of the rest of China.

In Yunnan the Mahomedans, always an unruly element, were numerous and powerful, and these were induced by the governing class, who were antipathetic to Yuan-Shih-Kai owing to his attempts to eradicate corruption, to take up arms against the Central Government. The rebels had a strong following, and it soon became apparent that the Governmental troops would have a difficult task in suppressing the revolt.

The first effect of the rebellion was, however, to cause the Government to hasten with the preparations for the formal adoption of the monarchy, and Yuan-Shih-Kai's coronation was

definitely fixed for February 9. The German and Austro-Hungarian Governments intimated that they would recognise the new monarchy, and the American and other nations neutral in the great war adopted an attitude of non-interference in the matter. The Japanese and other Entente Governments endeavoured, however, to dissuade the President from altering the form of the Chinese Government.

Whatever may have been the cause of his action, whether it was due to Japanese pressure or to the rebellion, Yuan-Shih-Kai shortly changed his mind once more, and before the end of January he announced that the inauguration of the new monarchy had been postponed indefinitely. This did not help to calm the rebels, however, for the rising continued to spread, and soon involved not only the whole of Yunnan, but the neighbouring provinces as well. In February the province of Kweichow declared its independence and joined Yunnan, and before long the enormous province of Szechuan (a territory larger than Germany and possessing 60,000,000 inhabitants) took the same course of action. By the end of April, nearly the whole of South China—Yunnan, Kweichow, Szechuan, Kwangsi, Kwangtung, Kiangsi, and Chekiang—had denounced the authority of the Peking Administration.

The Government's troops at first gained some successes in Szechuan, but the defection of Kwangsi and Kwangtung was fatal to the loyalists, and thereafter they were unable to gain control of the situation. The nucleus of the rebel or republican army consisted of some 30,000 Regular soldiers who had been stationed in Yunnan, and these were now under the personal command of the mutinous Military Governor of that province, an officer named Tsai Ao. The rebels were reported to possess thirteen batteries of modern cannon. Yuan originally intended to send a well-armed expeditionary force of 100,000 men against the republicans, but, as already stated, when the provinces dropped away one after another his plans were completely upset.

Finding that force would not avail him Yuan resorted to conciliation. On March 21 a proclamation was issued in Peking stating that the scheme to re-establish a monarchy had been totally abandoned by the President and his Government. This move did not appease the republican leaders, however, and they continued to accuse Yuan of having violated his oath to the Constitution by having attempted to make himself Emperor, and they persisted in their demand that he should resign altogether the reins of government. In his efforts to avoid this humiliating course of action Yuan-Shih-Kai formed a new Cabinet at the end of April, which was composed as follows:—

Premier—Tuan-Chi-Jui.

Foreign Minister—Lu-Chen-Hsing.

Finance Minister—Sun-Pao-Chi.

Minister of the Interior—Wang Y-itang.

Minister of Justice—Chang Tsung-Hsiang.
War Minister—Wang Chih-chen.
Minister of Marine—Lu-Kuan-Hsing.
Education Minister—Chang Kuo-Kan.
Minister of Commerce—Ching-Pan-Ping.
Minister of Communications—Tsao-Ju-Lin.

This new Cabinet proved no more successful than Yuan-Shih-Kai had been in controlling South China. A conference of representatives of the loyal provinces was held at Nanking in May in order to tender advice to the President respecting the demand of the South for his retirement, but the conference was unable to reach an agreement, mainly because no suitable successor to Yuan could be found. By this time Fukien and Hunan had seceded from the Central Government, in addition to the provinces already named. Thus just half the area of China proper was controlled by the rebels.

It became obvious at the end of May that the President would have to retire, but at this moment he was taken seriously ill, and he died of uræmia on June 6.

The late President was indubitably one of the half-dozen greatest Chinamen of the past half-century. His family had been highly distinguished for several generations, his grandfather having been a general of marked talent who played an important part in the suppression of the Taiping Rebellion. Yuan-Shih-Kai was born in 1859 at Hsiang Cheng in Honan. In early life he followed a military career, and in 1884 he was given command of the Chinese garrison in Korea. He became Imperial Resident in that dependency in 1885, and held this post for nine years. He subsequently held other important political posts, including that of Viceroy of Chihli. After the revolution, he was elected Provisional President in February, 1912, and President in October, 1913. Although Yuan-Shih-Kai had adopted temporarily the guise of a republican, there can be little doubt that his personal belief was that an autocratic form of Government was that best suited to the circumstances of China.

After the death of Yuan-Shih-Kai, there was nobody amongst his adherents in the north with sufficient strength of character to oppose the wishes of the southern leaders. The latter wished General Li Yuan-Hung, the Vice-President, to succeed immediately to the presidency, and as this was also the constitutional procedure, the Vice-President assumed office without any serious disturbances. His first acts showed that he intended to adhere to the forms of the republican Constitution. Parliament, which had been suspended by Yuan-Shih-Kai, was summoned. The Assembly was opened by Li Yuan-Hung on August 2, and the new President declared his adherence to the Constitution.

At the end of August Parliament approved of a reconstruction of Tuan-Chi-Jui's Cabinet, as follows :—

Premier and War Minister—Tuan-Chi-Jui.

Foreign Minister—Tang-Shao-Yi.

Finance Minister—Chen-Chin-Tau.

Minister of the Interior—Sun-Jung-Yi.

Minister of Justice—Chang-Yao-Cheng.

Minister of Marine—Chen-Pih-Kuan.

Education Minister—Fan-Yuan-Lien.

Minister of Commerce and Agriculture—Ku-Chung-Hsiu.

Minister of Communications—Hsu-Shih-Ying.

The new President had had a much less distinguished career than his predecessor, and his political experience was somewhat limited, though he had held the post of Military Governor of Wuchang.

During the last four months of the year there were no very important developments in Chinese politics, and save for occasional riots against the Japanese, the country remained in a quiet condition.

II. JAPAN.

During the year under consideration, Japan retained her position as one of the chief members of the "Entente" group of nations, but she played no very active part in actual military operations in any part of the world. The project of sending Japanese troops to Europe was, indeed, mooted, but it was condemned as impracticable and undesirable by nearly all Japanese statesmen. Nevertheless, Japan rendered appreciable assistance to Russia by supplying that Empire with munitions of war; and Japanese artillery officers took part in the great offensive operations initiated by General Brussiloff.

The adhesion of Japan to the Entente appears to have been approved by a large majority of the Japanese nation. There existed a section of the Opposition, and a very noisy section of the Press, who were hostile to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and desired to see Japan pursuing a course of development in Eastern Asia quite independently of Great Britain, France, and Russia, but there is no reason to suppose that these agitators had any influence over the Imperial Government. On the contrary, Count Okuma's Cabinet took measures to render still closer and more cordial the co-operation of Japan with the Entente countries, particularly with Russia. At the beginning of July, Japan concluded a treaty with Russia dealing with the affairs of the Far East. A translation of the terms of this treaty (which was drawn up in French) may be quoted here in full. The terms were as follows:—

"The Imperial Government of Japan and the Imperial Government of Russia, resolved to unite their efforts for the maintenance of lasting peace in the Far East, and have agreed upon the following:—

"Article 1. Japan will not be a party to any political arrangement or combination directed against Russia.

"Russia will not be a party to any political arrangement or combination directed against Japan.

"Article 2. Should the territorial rights or the special interests in the Far East of one of the contracting parties be threatened, Japan and Russia will take counsel of each other as to the measures to be taken in view of the support or the help to be given in order to safeguard and defend those rights and interests."

It will be seen that the terms of this new agreement were such that for all practical purposes it amounted to an alliance between the two Empires.

The political history of the country in the earlier part of the year was not very eventful. The attention of the public was, as usual, largely concentrated upon the relations with China. The Japanese Government continued to force its advice upon the Chinese Government, and in particular urged at the beginning of the year that the Chinese monarchy should not be re-established. The Japanese continued to be very unpopular in most parts of China, no doubt chiefly owing to the annexations of Chinese territory which Japan had made on several occasions in recent years, and affrays occurred from time to time between Chinese and Japanese residents. The Government's management of Chino-Japanese relations was subjected to considerable criticism.

On October 3, Count Okuma, who was seventy-eight years of age, announced that he was about to resign the post of Prime Minister. Count Okuma explained that his action was due solely to failing strength, as he believed that he still possessed the confidence of the nation. The retiring Premier recommended the Emperor to send for Viscount Kato, who though not a member of the Okuma Cabinet was one of the most influential statesmen of the Ministerial Party, and had previously held the post of Foreign Minister. The Mikado did not follow this advice, however, but asked Marshal Terauchi to form a Government. On October 9, it was announced that Marshal Terauchi had accepted the Emperor's offer, and had formed a Cabinet composed of the following statesmen:—

Minister of the Interior—Baron Goto.

Foreign Minister—Baron Motono.

War Minister—General Oshima.

Minister of Marine—Admiral Kato.

Minister of Justice—M. Nakashoji.

Minister of Communications—Baron Den.

Minister of Agriculture—M. Komatsubara.

The Prime Minister himself took the portfolio of Finance. Immediately after taking office Marshal Terauchi issued a statement upon his policy, and in reference to foreign affairs said: "The foreign policy of Japan does not change with the Cabinet. Our friends abroad are aware of this, and the agitation in America and elsewhere is based upon a misconception. Militarism and territorial aggrandisement are mere Jingo phrases. The soldiers of Japan have never been bullies or ruthless aggressors. Indeed, it would seem unnecessary to

outline the policy of the new Cabinet, which, after all, must be in the same accord with the wishes of the Emperor, and consequently have the same regard for all treaties, alliances, and friendships as the preceding Governments of the last half-century." In an address to the Governors of Provinces in Tokyo on October 28, the Premier enlarged upon this statement somewhat. He said that the alliance with Great Britain formed the very basis of Japanese foreign policy, and the results of this alliance were now seen to be highly gratifying. Japan's relations with other Powers were improving. The Premier went on to state that it was highly important to maintain Japanese unity during the war, and he said that he attached great importance to purity in the administration of the affairs of the State, and to economy and industry in the civil service.

When the new Government took office, Viscount Kato formed a new party which he styled the Kenseikai (Constitutionalists), and this party numbered about 200 deputies of the Lower House, that is, a small majority. The Kenseikai consisted of most of the members of the former political groups known as the Doshikai, Chuseikai, and Koyukai. Most of the members of the Kenseikai were strongly hostile to the new Cabinet, but Baron Kato himself stated that he proposed to give the Government critical support during the war. The position of the Cabinet in the Lower House was therefore very uncertain, but up to the end of the year Parliament had not yet met. The new Foreign Minister, Baron Motono, had been Ambassador in Petrograd for ten years, and had played a conspicuous part in bringing about the triangular understanding between Great Britain, Russia, and Japan.

On November 3 the elaborate ceremony of "installing" the Crown Prince took place. This function was regarded with almost as much excitement as the enthronement of the Mikado, and the day was a public holiday and the occasion for a great fête in Tokyo.

In December the death of Prince Oyama, who had been Commander-in-Chief of the whole Japanese Army in the war against Russia, was announced.

During the year a full and exact history of the military operations against Tsing-tau in 1914 was published. The German garrison consisted of 5,599 officers and men, of whom 360 were killed or died, and 550 wounded, the remainder being taken prisoners. The Japanese lost 416 men killed and 1,542 wounded. The Japanese found 150 guns in the fortress, together with about 30,000 rifles, and 5,000,000 rounds of rifle ammunition.

CHAPTER VII.

AFRICA.

I. THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA.

AFTER two disturbed and dramatic years, the Union of South Africa passed through a relatively quiet time in 1916, the storm centre of the British Empire having shifted to Australia. Under the surface there was still a contest between two deeply antagonistic political forces, Imperialism and Nationalism, but it remained under the surface; and this year there were no vitally important crises in the history of the country such as the rebellion of 1914 and the General Election of 1915. It will be remembered that the election had left the Ministerialists with a minority in the Lower House of the Union Parliament, the Prime Minister, General Botha, possessing only 54 followers in that House, out of the total membership of 130. In practice, however, General Botha's position was a fairly secure one, since on all the really important questions of the day he could count upon the support of the Unionists, or "British" party, who mustered 40 members. The Unionists, led by Sir Thomas Smaart, were still known as the Official Opposition, but they and the South African Party had been in informal alliance in the elections, and they co-operated, though again informally, in Parliament throughout the year.

The real opposition was the Nationalist Party, led by that able and vigorous extremist, General Hertzog. There were only 27 Nationalist members of the Lower House, but they were stronger in the country than in Parliament, and represented over half the Dutch population of the Union. The Nationalists were anti-imperialists, and their views may be compared to those of the French Nationalists of Quebec and to those of the Sinn Fein party in Ireland, all those three parties being separatist in their tendencies.¹ Although most of the Nationalists were ostensibly constitutional and loyal to the British connexion, they were all notoriously sympathetic to the rebels, and it was significant that during 1916, when a number of the rebels were still in gaol serving their various sentences, some of these prisoners were elected officials of the Nationalist party organisation.

The country being divided in this manner, it was not surprising that the Union contributed much less to the Empire's armies than did New Zealand, a Dominion with almost the same white population. During the rebellion and the campaign in German South-West Africa as many as 70,000 loyalist troops had been out on service, but after the German Colony had been conquered, many of these men returned to their homes.

¹ The struggle between Imperialism and Nationalism in South Africa and the issues in the General Election were very fully described in the *ANNUAL REGISTER*, 1915.

Nevertheless, a South African "Overseas Contingent" of 11,000 was sent to Europe, and was at the disposal of the British Government, and in addition it was known that at least 8,000 South Africans had gone to Europe individually and had enlisted in the new British armies. Moreover, the main burden of the campaign in East Africa, described elsewhere, fell upon South Africa, and the Union found 24,000 troops—a full division, for this purpose. Thus having regard to the fact that a large section of the community was avowedly opposed to the war, the number of troops raised was quite creditable to the pro-war parties. There was, of course, no question of conscription for Overseas service, as such a proposal would have been obviously unrealisable in the face of the antagonism and strength of the Hertzogites.

A question which raised a good deal of feeling during the year was that of the pay of the Overseas contingents. These were paid not at ordinary South African or Dominion rates but at Imperial rates, which were much lower than the Dominion rates. The pay of British troops was on a much lower scale than that of the Canadian and Australian troops, and than that of the South African troops when the latter were being employed within the Union and in German South-West Africa. The Unionists pressed the Government to raise the pay of the Overseas contingents up to the usual South African standard, but this the Prime Minister refused to do. The Ministry were somewhat averse from discussing fully their motives for refusing this concession, but they were evidently fearful of asking Parliament to sanction the Unionist proposal. The Nationalists were bitterly opposed to spending money on the Overseas contingents, and indeed disliked war expenditure of any kind. The extravagance of the Government's war expenditure was one of the Nationalist Party's strongest arguments in the constituencies, and it is therefore possible that the Government were anxious not to re-inforce that argument; it is also possible that some of General Botha's own Boer followers would not have approved of the higher rate of pay. But whatever the reason, the South Africans remained the only Dominion troops paid at British rates.

The finances of this Dominion were in a state which was as satisfactory as could be expected under the war conditions. The ordinary Budget for 1915-16 showed a small surplus, which had not been anticipated. The expenditure, apart from extraordinary war expenditure, amounted to 16,258,000*l.* and the revenue to 16,529,000*l.* As regards the Budget for 1916-17, the Finance Minister, Mr. Burton, estimated that the expenditure, again exclusive of war expenditure, would amount to 17,877,000*l.*, whereas the receipts, on the basis of the 1915 taxes, would amount to only 16,366,000*l.* Additional taxation therefore became necessary, and this was provided for in the Budget, the most important of the new imposts being a special tax on

gold-mining profits, a tax on the export of diamonds, a super-tax on incomes, and taxes on spirits. Further, a portion of the so-called bewaarplaatsen receipts was to be appropriated in order to assist in meeting the deficit. These bewaarplaatsen receipts represented special Crown rights over mining in certain areas. By means of these receipts and the additional taxes, it was hoped to raise the revenue to within 200,000*l.* of the expenditure. The income super-tax involved a slight increase in the rate on incomes of over 2,500*l.* These figures, as already stated, have no relation to the war expenditure.

The war expenditure was met entirely out of loan. The debt of the Union at the beginning of the year 1916-17 (April 1) was 151,000,000*l.* The loan expenditure for 1916-17 was estimated by the Ministry of Finance at 5,943,000*l.*, which was, however, by no means exclusively war expenditure. Only 3,225,000*l.* was expected to be spent on the war, the remainder being expenditure on various development schemes—railway expansion, irrigation, and so forth. The small total of South Africa's war expenditure is a striking illustration of the inequality in the distribution of the war burden in the British Empire, a fact of which other instances have been given in the ANNUAL REGISTER. The people of the United Kingdom were burdened by a war expenditure of nearly 50*l.* per annum per head of population, whereas the fortunate Afrikaners paid only about 3*l.* per head. Mr. Burton estimated that the total war expenditure of the Union from August 4, 1914, to March 31, 1917, would amount to 26,693,000*l.* This figure includes, of course, the cost of suppressing the rebellion. Of this total, 23,454,000*l.* had been raised by loans.

In South Africa the railway Budget is completely separate from the ordinary general Budget, the railway revenue being applied exclusively to railway purposes. The railway revenue for 1916-17 was estimated at 15,024,000*l.* and the expenditure at 15,066,000*l.* The railways formed an important asset possessed by the Dominion, as against its indebtedness of 151,000,000*l.*

During the Spring session of the national legislature, which closed on June 19, some important Bills were passed, the two larger parties wisely taking the opportunity to push forward non-party measures during the truce to ordinary party politics. The most notable of these measures were three University Acts, a Miners Phthisis Bill, and certain consolidating Acts dealing with Patents, Lunacy, Insolvency, and other matters. The three University Acts provided firstly, for the establishment of a new University of South Africa, to include all the University Colleges in the country, with the exception of those at Cape Town (the old South African College) and Stellenbosch, the headquarters of the new institution to be at Pretoria. Secondly, the old South African College was given a separate university charter, and thirdly, the Victoria College, Stellenbosch, was

likewise converted into a distinct university. This scheme caused some resentment in Johannesburg, where it was held that the new educational measures did not do justice to that rich and important town.

A Bill of a more contentious character was the Trading with the Enemy Bill, which was passed in spite of vigorous Nationalist opposition. This Act followed the lines of the similar Acts in Great Britain and the other Dominions, and prohibited trading with the enemy and gave the Administration power to intern alien enemies.

The proposal made by certain persons in England that South African natives should be recruited for combatant service in Europe was almost unanimously condemned by the white inhabitants of South Africa, but 10,000 Kaffirs were recruited to work as dock labourers in France, and a still larger number were utilised in non-combatant capacities in East Africa.

Statistics relating to the white population of the four provinces in 1914 were published, and the totals were as follows: Cape, 587,046; Natal, 98,934; Transvaal, 494,600; O.F.S., 192,586.

On November 29, Marthinus Theunis Steyn, ex-President of the Orange Free State, died suddenly at Bloemfontein, whilst addressing a Women's Congress. He was born in 1857. After the Boer War he went into complete retirement, but it was known that he sympathised with the Nationalist Party, and even to some extent with the Rebellion of 1914.

It was reported that during the year there were new conspiracies for a rebellion, but, even if these reports were reliable, the conspiracies gained no influential supporters.

II. RHODESIA.

Much the most important question raised in connexion with this Colony during the year was the proposal discussed by the Chartered Company itself, to amalgamate the two territories of Southern and Northern Rhodesia. Early in the year Sir Starr Jameson went out from England to Rhodesia to explain to the colonists the views which the Chartered Company held on this question. The Directors of the Company considered that the time had arrived for the amalgamation of the territories, but Sir Starr Jameson's proposals met with a somewhat unfavourable reception in the Colony, especially in Southern Rhodesia. It was held, in the first place, that it was inopportune to raise Constitutional questions of this kind during the war. Also, the southern territory desired to be endowed with responsible government at an early date, and it was correctly urged that if the territory were united to its undeveloped sub-tropical neighbour, which possessed a large black population and very few white men, the coming of responsible government would be postponed. Moreover, many of the colonists in Southern Rhodesia looked rather to ultimate union with South

Africa than to amalgamation with Northern Rhodesia, and it was contended that the Zambesi, not the Limpopo, was the natural dividing line in this part of Africa. However, the Company were inclined to press their proposal in spite of the opposition, and at the beginning of August a draft of the proposed scheme was published. By the provisions of this draft the Legislative Council was to consist of seven nominated and fifteen elected members, three of the latter representing Northern Rhodesia, and twelve Southern Rhodesia. The two High Courts were to be united and the Law was to be Roman Dutch. Barotseland was to be excluded.

The elected members of the Southern Rhodesian Legislative Council met in Conference, and passed a resolution by 6 votes to 3 advising the postponement of the consideration of the scheme until after the war. The Directors of the Company had proposed to call a special session of the Legislative Council in September to consider the scheme, but after the passing of the above-mentioned resolution, the special session was cancelled. Thus this important matter remained in abeyance until the end of the year.

In spite of the war conditions, the rich little community of Southern Rhodesia continued to be very prosperous, and cattle-farming flourished on a huge scale. It was officially reported that there were 840,000 head of cattle in the Colony, of which about half belonged to natives and half to the white settlers.

Conditions in the more tropical northern territory were necessarily different, and the white population of Northern Rhodesia still numbered under 3,000.

III. NYASSALAND.

In February the report of the Commission set up to investigate the circumstances of the Nyassaland Native Rising of the previous year¹ was published. The Commissioners found that the rising was mainly due to the inflammatory influence of various "Christian" missions, such as that of the sect of Seventh Day Baptists; and that the object of the movement was to massacre or expel all the white inhabitants and set up a native state of a religious character, with John Chilembwe, the ring-leader, at its head. An aggravating cause of the rising was the bad treatment of natives on the Bruce Estates. Chilembwe had been educated in the United States. The Commissioners recommended that inflammatory religious literature should be suppressed in the territory, and that sects of the character of the Seventh Day Baptists should be excluded by law.

Plans were propounded during the year for extending the Shiré Highland Railway northwards as far as Lake Nyassa.

IV. PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA.

The Colony of Mozambique remained in an extremely stagnant condition. It was reported during the year that of the

¹ See A.R., 1915, p. 319.

10,000 white people living in this enormous territory, the area of which is nearly 300,000 square miles, only 1,000 were unofficial persons, all the remainder being either military, police, or civil servants. The finances for the year 1914-15 showed a revenue of 133,000*l.* and an expenditure of 134,000*l.*

V. CAMEROON.

At the opening of the year this German Colony was completely conquered by the British, French, and Belgian troops which had been invading it for more than a year previously. On January 1 the town of Yaunde, which had been the German capital for many months, was taken by the Allied troops, but the German garrison was not surrounded and therefore was not captured. The Germans fled southwards with the evident intention of reaching Spanish Guinea, and this they succeeded in doing, despite the attempt which a Franco-British force stationed in the south (based on the port of Kampo) made to cut them off. In this way nearly the whole German population of the Colony, and not the military force only, escaped into neutral territory. The German fugitives reached the frontier of Spanish Guinea about January 20, and there they were duly disarmed, being ultimately conveyed to Spain.

After the occupation of the country had been completed, the French took over the administration of the whole Colony, and the British and Belgian forces were accordingly withdrawn.

VI. TOGOLAND.

This German Colony had already been conquered completely before the beginning of 1916. The country was divided into two spheres, one administered by the French and the other by the British; and this arrangement was maintained throughout the year.

VII. NIGERIA.

This large Colony passed through the year without any political disturbances; but in the autumn the affairs of the territory came under discussion in England, owing to the sale by auction in London on November 14, 15, and 16, of the extensive enemy properties in the Colony which had been sequestered by the British authorities. The auction was open to neutral purchasers, as well as to British and Allied bidders, and this fact was severely criticised by one party in England, and an important debate on the matter took place in Parliament (see *English History*, p. 181). In June the Imperial Government directed Nigeria and all the West African Colonies to impose a duty of 2*l.* per ton on the export of palm-kernels to foreign countries for five years after the conclusion of the war, the object being to ruin the German manufacture of palm-oil.

VIII. BRITISH EAST AFRICA AND GERMAN EAST AFRICA.

The attention of the colonists in British East Africa was necessarily concentrated almost completely upon the campaign which was being waged on their borders. Early in the year a Bill was passed by the Legislative Council at Nairobi making all male British subjects between the ages of eighteen and forty-five liable for obligatory military service. The Bill provided for the conscription of men of both European and Asiatic origin. The Government explained that it was hoped that no emergency would arise of sufficient gravity to warrant putting the new Act into force, but it was deemed desirable that the Government should possess the power to use compulsion if necessary. It was not reported that the new powers were required to be used during the year.

The financial position of the Colony was fairly satisfactory. The financial year 1915-16 ended with a surplus of 120,000*l.*, which it was expected would be further increased by March 31, 1917. The estimated revenue for the year 1916-17 was 1,292,418*l.*, and the estimated expenditure was 1,250,988*l.*

At the beginning of the year the Germans still retained possession of their great colony in East Africa. It was the only overseas possession of the German Empire which had not been conquered. In February, however, the British Government set to work in earnest to organise the conquest of the territory. General Smith-Dorrien resigned the command in East Africa, and General Smuts, the famous Boer Imperialist, took over the command of the operations. The result of the campaign was, of course, a foregone conclusion, but the difficulties to be encountered were, nevertheless, very great. The terrain, consisting largely of tropical forest, presented great obstacles to an invading force. The German population of the Colony, including women and children, numbered only 5,000, and the military force included only 250 white men, but after war broke out this handful of Germans began training the natives for military service, and although their supplies of arms were limited, they succeeded in creating a force strong enough to be troublesome. The Britannic army was enormously superior in numbers, General Smuts having over 20,000 men from the Union of South Africa alone. The colony was invaded simultaneously from four quarters. Much the largest force, that under the immediate direction of General Smuts, advanced from British East Africa and captured Moshi, the terminus of the railway from Tanga, on March 13. Two small Belgian forces crossed the frontier from the Congo, one south, and the other north of Lake Kivu. Thirdly, small British contingents advanced from Rhodesia, and fourthly a Portuguese force struck north across the river Rovuma.

After the capture of Moshi the Uganda Railway was extended to that place, and in the meantime General Van Deventer, of

South-West Africa fame (see A.R., 1915), struck due south towards the main German Railway, which ran from Dar-es-Salaam through Tabora to Lake Tanganyika, at Ujiji. Van Deventer took Kothersheim on April 14 and Koanda Irangi on April 19, the latter place being about 150 miles south of the British frontier. For the next three months General Smuts's force fought its way down the northern railway, and on July 7 the port of Tanga was occupied. At the beginning of August the Belgian force occupied Ujiji; and General Van Deventer's army, marching rapidly southwards, seized stretches of the Central Railway, over 100 miles of the track being in possession of the British by the end of July. Van Deventer advanced eastwards along the railway whilst the force which had taken Tanga closed in towards Dar-es-Salaam from the north. Throughout these operations the engagements which took place were on a very small scale, and the casualties were fortunately very few. The Germans attempted to delay Van Deventer at Kilossa, a place on the railway, about 150 miles west of Dar-es-Salaam, and an action was fought at this spot on August 21. Van Deventer occupied the place the following day. On September 3 a combined naval and military attack was made on Dar-es-Salaam, the German capital, seamen being landed in whalers, and the town was taken. After this climax to General Smuts's advance, the great drive was steadily continued, but up to the end of the year the German force maintained a show of resistance in the wild country in the south of the Colony.

IX. THE BELGIAN CONGO.

In the internal affairs of this Colony, no very noteworthy events occurred. Although no formal annexation took place, the Belgian dominion in Africa was in practice extended eastwards, as a large part of German East Africa—the north-western district—was given over to Belgian administration. Colonel Malfeyt, an officer with much experience of the Congo, was appointed Governor, and the headquarters of the new administration were at Tabora.

X. MOROCCO.

As a result of the war and the consequent liberty to ignore German wishes, the French control over Morocco became increasingly complete. It was announced in May that the Italian Government had signed an agreement whereby Italy renounced for her consuls and establishments in Morocco the privileges extended to them under the Capitulations, the Italian Colony in Morocco thus becoming subject to the French courts.

During the autumn some uneasiness was caused in France by the state of affairs in the Spanish zone, where Germans were still numerous. It was feared that these Germans might stir up the tribes, and especially the virtually independent chief Raisuli, to attack the French part of Morocco.

XI. ABYSSINIA.

During the year a revolution took place in Abyssinia. At the end of September the more important chiefs met in conference and formally deposed the young Emperor, Lidj Jeassu, and declared Ouizero Zeoditu, daughter of the late Emperor Menelik, to be Empress. The father of Lidj Jeassu, the chief Ras Mikrael, did not accept his son's deposition quietly, and civil war broke out. A sanguinary battle was fought at Tara, a place between Ancobar and Dabri Abraham, on October 27, and Ras Mikrael's troops, who were greatly outnumbered, were totally defeated, whilst he himself was taken prisoner. This victory rendered the position of the new Empress fairly secure, but Lidj Jeassu himself was not captured.

XII. EGYPT.

The strategic position of Egypt, midway between Western Europe and the Orient, caused the country to be a great centre of military activity, and as in the previous year a very large number of troops were stationed in the land. Moreover, fighting actually took place on the frontiers of Egypt, not only in the region of the Suez Canal, but on the western border as well. The tribes on the western frontier, more particularly the powerful Senussi, were troublesome to the British authorities during the winter 1915-16. On January 23 an engagement took place with a well-armed force of 5,000 of these Senussi, the tribesmen being under the lead of Turkish and even of German officers. The Senussi had three field-guns and several machine-guns. The enemy were driven off with loss, but the British had 28 men killed and 274 wounded. On February 26 another action took place, fifty miles east of the Tripoli frontier, the enemy's leader, Nuri Bey (a brother of Enver Pasha) being killed. The first of these actions occurred near Mersa-Matruh and the second near Barani. On March 14 the British captured Sollum, which the Arabs had held since they first invaded Egypt in November, 1915. The Arab invasion having been repelled, an administrative reform was put into force. The reconquered district, from Mersa-Matruh to the frontier, was organised into a separate administrative area, and was named the Western Governorate. The district was placed under the authority of the Director-General of the Coast Guards, L. G. Hunter Pasha. After this, the centre of interest was in the Suez Canal region. It will be remembered that the British had withdrawn from the Turco-Egyptian frontier to the canal, the Turks thus occupying a portion of British territory. In April, however, the British advanced, and on April 23 actions were fought simultaneously at Katia and at Duweidar. At Katia the Turks had some success, and captured a number of the Worcestershire yeomanry, but at Duweidar they suffered a defeat, and they subsequently retired to Bir-el-Abd.

On August 4 the Turkish Army in the Sinai Peninsula took the offensive, and a general engagement ensued near Katia. The enemy were 18,000 strong, and attacked on a front of seven miles. The Turks were decisively defeated; they lost nearly 4,000 men in prisoners, about 1,300 killed, four guns, and nine machine guns, and Bir-el-Abd was captured by the British. During the remainder of the year the British steadily advanced, recovering Egyptian territory, and on December 21 they occupied El Arish.

In the autumn it was announced that Sir Henry McMahon would retire, and that Sir Reginald Wingate, Governor-General of the Sudan, would become High Commissioner for Egypt. Sir R. Wingate took over the post on January 1, 1917.

Egyptian financial affairs were in a highly satisfactory condition in the year 1915-16, and the year closed with an excellent surplus. The expenditure for that year was £. 15,324,259½., and the revenue £. 17,759,418½. The revenue showed an improvement under nearly all headings—customs, direct taxes, railways, tobacco taxes, etc. On the other side of the account economies were effected in various directions, including irrigation, railway administration and development, education, and the public health department. It is doubtful, however, whether the rigid restriction of expenditure in these directions was altogether desirable.

XIII. SUDAN.

The Sudan was not entirely free from war during this year. The small semi-independent state of Darfur, situated on the border of the province of Kordofan, had long been a source of trouble to the Sudan Government, the ruler, Sultan Ali Dinar, being hostile to the British. The Sultan denounced the British suzerainty before the end of 1915, and began raiding the border. In March a small expedition, under the command of Colonel Kelly, was dispatched to deal with the Sultan. The Darfurese army, consisting of 3,000 men, retired on the capital, the town of El Fasher. On May 22 a battle was fought near a village named Beringia, the Darfurese being routed, and on the following day the British occupied El Fasher. After this event the Sultan was expelled from his monarchy, and the territory was incorporated in the Sudan. There were some grounds for the belief that the misguided Sultan had been stirred up by Turco-German intrigues.

In April the Prince of Wales made a tour through the Sudan, visiting Khartoum and other places.

In the Budget for 1916, the estimates of expenditure and revenue were fixed at £. 1,642,500½., this figure being slightly higher than the realised revenue and the actual expenditure of 1915. On the side of the revenue, this increase was chiefly due to higher receipts being anticipated from railways, steamers, and forests.

CHAPTER VIII.

AMERICA.

I. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ITS DEPENDENCIES.

IN the year under consideration the United States of America presented the sharpest possible contrast to the great nations of Europe. Whilst the whole energy of all these nations was concentrated upon the problems of mutual destruction, the people of the great republic pursued the arts of peace, and advanced in wealth, prosperity, and culture, and prepared themselves to play a truly humanitarian part in the difficult times which were approaching not only for the maimed and exhausted belligerent nations but for all mankind.

The position of the American nation was dissimilar from that of any of the neutral peoples of Europe. America stood aloof from the belligerents, and yet could not be without sympathy for any one of them, for she was compounded of them all. Each country of Europe was the old fatherland of some citizens of the United States. And yet although America had these ties of sentiment and blood with one or other of the suffering peoples of the Old World—ties of sentiment which were felt by all Americans save perhaps the descendants of those old founders of the republic who had thrown off the British yoke—the dominant political feeling was that the North American Republic itself constituted the leading state of that World which had been significantly styled New. The enormous majority of Americans desired to have no part, and were, indeed, determined to have no part, in the inter-tribal feuds of what they regarded as the more backward continent. The federal republic had been intended by its founders to be a new experiment in human statecraft, which should pursue its course untrammelled by the politics of Europe, and as such modern Americans were determined that it should remain. It might be the destiny of Canada and Australia to be linked on to one European Power, to one of Europe's two great militant parties, but such a destiny was not deemed conceivable for the American Republic, and would indeed have been utterly alien to all her traditions. America was not a nation of the same World, which happened to be temporarily neutral, such as Sweden or Holland; she was a nation of a New World, living in a different sphere, thinking other thoughts.

These, then, were the dominant political conceptions of nearly all American citizens, and it is impossible to understand the course of the various controversies which arose between the United States Government and the several belligerents unless the leading motives of the American Government be borne in mind. The ordinary American was not in the first place either pro-British or pro-German or pro-French, he was a good

American; and in this no man could have been more truly representative of his fellow-countrymen than the great and learned President, Mr. Woodrow Wilson. As will be seen, the President by his attitude in international politics succeeded in getting himself disliked by the more extreme partisans of both European groups, but his countrymen regarded this as an almost inevitable consequence of the fact that his actions were dictated by a neutrality which was real and impartial and not "benevolent" to either party.

Nevertheless, with every desire to stand entirely outside the conflict it was not possible for the American Government to avoid friction with the belligerents, and the opening of the year found Mr. Wilson engaged in disputes with both Great Britain and Germany. The dispute with Great Britain arose out of that country's alleged infringement of neutral rights on the sea, more particularly the British interference with neutral mails, and controversy with Germany was caused by the activity of German submarines, especially by the notorious *Lusitania* incident, which still remained unsettled. On January 10 the United States Government addressed a protest to Great Britain in reference to this question of the seizure of mails. The memorandum stated that—

"The Government of the United States is informed that His Britannic Majesty's authorities have removed from the Danish steamer *Oscar II.* 734 bags of mail *en route* from the United States to Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, and that His Majesty's port authorities have also removed from the Swedish ship *Stockholm* 58 bags of mail *en route* from Gothenburg to New York; that 5,000 packages of merchandise, American property, were seized by the British authorities on the Danish steamer *United States* on her latest voyage to the United States, and that the authorities at Kirkwall on December 18 last seized 597 bags of parcels mail carried by S.S. *Frederick VIII.* and manifested for Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Other similar cases might be mentioned, such as that of S.S. *Helig Olav.*"

The note went on to state that the United States Government were inclined to regard parcels post articles as subject to the same treatment as articles sent by express or freight in respect of belligerent search, seizure, and condemnation, but they regarded parcels post articles as entitled to the usual protection of neutral trade, about the interference with which the American Government had already complained. Further instances of the seizure, or alleged seizure, of mails between America and European neutrals (Holland) by the British authorities were cited, and the note went on to announce that "the Government of the United States is unable to admit the right of His Majesty's authorities forcibly to bring into port neutral vessels plying directly between American and neutral European ports without intention of touching at British ports,

and there to remove or censor mails carried by them." Modern practice generally recognises that mails are not to be censored, confiscated, or destroyed on the high seas even when carried by belligerent mail ships, and it seems certainly to follow that to bring mail ships within British jurisdiction for purposes of search and then to subject them to local regulations allowing a censorship of mails cannot be justified on the ground of national jurisdiction. The memorandum also lodged a protest against any interference with the mails on neutral mail ships which merely touched at British ports. It was further stated that "as a result of British action public feeling is being aroused in the United States through the loss of valuable letters, and foreign banks are refusing to cash American drafts owing to the absence of any assurance that they will travel safely in the mails. Moreover, the possible detention of official mails is an aggravating circumstance in a practice which affects American public opinion as being vexatiously inquisitorial and without compensating military advantage to Great Britain. The Government of the United States very urgently presses for the early application of an effective remedy."

The British Foreign Office sent a reply to the Hon. W. H. Page, which was dated January 25, and which was worded as follows:—

"YOUR EXCELLENCY,—The communication which your Excellency was good enough to make on the 10th instant regarding the seizure of mails from neutral vessels raises important questions of principle in regard to matters which are determined by the policy jointly decided and acted upon by the Allied Governments. His Majesty's Government are therefore compelled to communicate with their Allies before they can send a reply to your memorandum. They are consulting with the French Government in the first instance, and I hope to be in a position before long to state the result of this consultation.

"(Signed) E. GREY."

The British Foreign Office also published in the Press a statement to the effect that—

"To avoid any misapprehension on the point, it may be stated that as a matter of fact no mails have been censored or removed from neutral ships brought forcibly into port for the purposes of search."

It will be seen that the two friendly Governments were not precisely in agreement about the actual facts of what had occurred, and the controversy thus opened dragged on for months, the American Government and American traders constantly complaining of British interference both with mails and with legitimate neutral trade.

The feeling against Great Britain was strong in many parts of the United States, and spread to circles outside the German and Irish communities, where of course it was perennial and

had to be discounted. A debate on the British blockade of Germany took place in the Senate on January 20, and Great Britain was hotly attacked by some speakers, but nevertheless warmly defended by others. Thus Senator Hoke Smith moved a resolution condemning the blockade as grossly violating in many respects the regulations of International Law, and proposing that an embargo should be placed on the export of munitions of war to the Allies unless the blockade were modified in various important respects, including the admission of cotton into Germany. Senator Smith's arguments were, however, attacked by Senator Williams of Mississippi, who referred to the Allies as the "forces making for peace, liberty, contract-keeping, and righteousness," and said that the embargo proposed by Senator Smith was not only unjustifiable on moral grounds, but would prove ruinous to the United States, especially to the cotton-growing South. The controversy continued, but no such embargo was imposed by the United States Government.

The disputes between America and Great Britain and her Allies¹ were disagreeable and at times almost acrimonious, but the controversies which arose with Germany were of a much graver character. As was said in America, injuries to American trade could not be compared in seriousness to the loss of American lives; and consequently the discussion with Germany assumed a serious and even threatening aspect. In February, however, what appeared for the time to be an agreement was reached in regard to the *Lusitania* affair, Germany conceding some of the points for which the United States had been contending. The German Government at last expressed themselves as willing to admit that though retaliation (*e.g.*, against the illegal aspects of the British blockade) might be justifiable, it was not permissible in circumstances where the safety of neutrals might be endangered, and the German Government was therefore prepared to pay full compensation for the loss of American lives in the sinking of the *Lusitania*. Furthermore, the German Government undertook not to sink unarmed merchantmen without warning, and not without providing for the safety of the passengers and crews, except, of course, in cases in which the vessels resisted or tried to escape.

This, however, by no means ended the controversy over the use of submarines; more particularly because the German Government announced in February that they proposed to sink armed merchantmen at sight after March 1; nor did the American Government seem to be wholly satisfied even on the more limited question of the *Lusitania* incident. A section of opinion in America, led by the ex-Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, were indeed entirely satisfied with Germany's attitude, and held that if American citizens chose to travel on armed mercantile vessels belonging to belligerent states they must do so at their own risk,

¹ Chiefly with Great Britain, not with the other Entente Powers, because the matters were almost exclusively maritime.

and that the American Government owed them no protection in such circumstances. Many Congressmen took this view. It was not, however, President Wilson's view, and at the time that the matter was being mooted in Congress, in February, he wrote a letter to Senator Stone, dealing with the question.

Mr. Wilson said in this letter that he was confident that the controversy with the Central Powers would be settled peacefully, but that nevertheless "no nation, no group of nations, has the right while war is in progress to alter or disregard the principles which all nations have agreed upon in mitigation of the horrors and sufferings of war, and, if the clear rights of American citizens should ever unhappily be abridged or denied by any such action, we should, it seems to me, have in honour no choice as to what our own course should be. For my own part, I cannot consent to any abridgment of the rights of American citizens in any respect. The honour and self-respect of the nation are involved. We covet peace and shall preserve it at any cost but loss of honour. . . . It is important to reflect that if in this instance we allowed expediency to take the place of principle, the door would inevitably be opened to still further concessions. Once accept a single abatement of right and many other humiliations would certainly follow, and the whole fine fabric of International Law might crumble under our hands piece by piece. What we are contending for in this matter is of the very essence of the things that have made America a sovereign nation. She cannot yield them without conceding her own impotency as a nation and making a virtual surrender of her independent position among the nations of the world."

The opinions set forth by Mr. Wilson on the German-American dispute were criticised on the one hand by his regular Republican opponents as being unduly feeble, and on the other hand by the pacifist wing of the Democrats as being unreasonably exacting and liable to involve America in the war. The latter faction, the more Radical section of the Democrats, made a great move in both Houses of Congress to alter the American attitude towards Germany by attempting to pass resolutions warning United States citizens to refrain from travelling on armed merchantmen of belligerents. The prospect of this serious revolt in his own party did not cow the President, however. In a speech to the famous Gridiron Club at the end of February he said: "America ought to keep out of this war. She ought to keep out of this war at the sacrifice of everything except this single thing upon which her character and history are founded. If she sacrifices that, she has ceased to be America, she has ceased to entertain or to love traditions which have made us proud to be Americans; and when we go about seeking safety at the expense of humanity, then I for one will believe that I have always been mistaken in what I have conceived to be the spirit of American history."

The whole matter was fought out in Congress at the begin-

ning of March, and terminated in a victory for the President's policy. On February 21 Mr. Wilson interviewed at the White House Mr. Stone and Mr. Flood, the Chairmen of the Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives respectively, who came to him to inquire why he was not satisfied with the concessions made by Germany in respect of the *Lusitania* incident, and why he appeared to intend to insist upon the right of Americans to travel safely on armed belligerent merchantmen. Mr. Wilson stated again, what, however, he had previously made clear, that he intended to insist upon Americans being allowed to travel on whatever merchant ships they pleased. This caused the Democrats present great annoyance, and on the following day a resolution was tabled in the House of Representatives, with the approval of Mr. Flood, warning Americans not to travel in the armed merchantmen of belligerents.

Mr. Wilson was very willing to see the whole matter discussed in Congress, for his position was obviously a strong one, since though a large part of his own party would no doubt vote in favour of the proposed hostile resolutions, it would clearly be impossible for the relatively chauvinistic Republicans not to oppose the resolution, without stultifying all their own previous criticisms of the Administration. Nevertheless, the rank and file of the Democrats were in a position to make the situation extremely unpleasant for their leader, and before the matter was actually decided in Congress, Mr. Wilson went so far as to inform the leading members of his party that if the resolutions passed he might feel called upon to resign the Presidency, an act which would, of course, have been quite without precedent. This threat was subsequently modified to the much more mild statement that in the event of his foreign policy being defeated, he would not stand as Democratic candidate in the Presidential election which was due in the coming autumn. Even this threat had its effect in rallying some of the Democrats, for they saw no likelihood of finding another candidate as powerful as Mr. Wilson.

The debate first came to a head in the Senate, where the voting on the resolution took place on March 3. The resolution, which was introduced by Mr. Gore, was postponed indefinitely, that is to say defeated, by 68 votes to 14. After a heated but not very prolonged debate in the House of Representatives, a similar resolution warning Americans not to travel in armed belligerent merchantmen, which was proposed by Mr. McLeMORE, was defeated on March 7 by 276 votes to 143.

Thus both Houses of Congress showed themselves prepared to strengthen Mr. Wilson's hands, and from the President's point of view it was as well that it was so, for the German Government were not inclined to withdraw or modify their declaration that from March 1 onwards armed merchantmen belonging to Great Britain and her Allies would be treated by submarines as warships, and would therefore be torpedoed with-

out warning at every possible opportunity. Mr. Lansing, the Secretary of State, inquired of the German Government what this new declaration precisely meant, and early in March the German Government sent a long explanation to the American Administration, through Count Bernstorff, the German Ambassador at Washington. This explanation stated that at the beginning of the war, on the proposal of the American Government, Germany declared herself prepared to ratify immediately the Declaration of London on naval warfare. German prize regulations based on this Declaration had already been published without reservation, in the expectation that the existing stipulations of international law assuring the legal commerce of neutrals, even with belligerents, and the freedom of the seas would be fully observed. England on the contrary refused to ratify the Declaration of London,¹ and after the outbreak of war began to restrict the legal commerce of neutrals in order to strike at Germany. Further, on November 3, 1914, the British declared the whole of the North Sea a war area, a protest against this by the neutral Powers being unavailing. In February, 1915, Germany was obliged to adopt reprisals against this action of the enemy contrary to International Laws. She made choice of a new weapon, the application of which was not yet regulated by International Law and the employment of which would therefore not infringe any existing right, this new weapon being the submarine. The memorandum then points out that Germany showed greater willingness than England to fall in with American conceptions of International Law; England, in particular, having rejected the American proposal that food-stuffs for the non-combatant population of Germany should be allowed to be imported and distributed under American supervision. Furthermore, England, by her new order of March 11, 1915, destroyed the last remnant of the legal freedom of neutral commerce with Germany and with the neutral States adjacent to Germany, the object being to conquer Germany by starvation.

England rendered submarine warfare according to International Law impossible by arming nearly all her merchant vessels and instructing the seamen as to means of attack and the use of the guns provided. These orders are contrary to the declaration which the British Ambassador made in Washington on May 25, 1914.

The German Government had hoped that it would be possible for the neutral Powers to arrange for the disarmament of merchant vessels on the basis of the United States' proposal of January 23, 1916. In fact, however, the arming of merchantmen with guns has continued, and the reports of rewards that have been paid to commanders of merchantmen who have been successful in fighting submarines show the result of the instruc-

¹ The reader may be reminded that Great Britain was not legally bound by the Declaration of London.

tions issued to merchant captains. Germany is therefore confronted with the following facts :—

(a) That a blockade contrary to International Law has for a year past prevented neutral commerce from reaching German ports, and made German exports impossible.

(b) That for a year and a half, tightening of the contraband regulations in a manner contrary to International Law has prevented all oversea traffic with neighbouring neutral countries in which Germany is concerned.

(c) That communication with neutral countries is prevented by illegal interference with mails.

(d) That neighbouring neutral countries are oppressed in order to prevent traffic across Germany's land-frontiers.

(e) That Germans, whether combatants or non-combatants, are seized on the high seas.

(f) And that the enemy have armed merchantmen for offensive purposes, thereby rendering impossible the use of submarines according to the principles set forth in the Declaration of London.

The German statement ended by saying that " the Imperial Government hopes, in view of the friendly relations which have existed for a hundred years past between the two countries, that the standpoint here set forth will be appreciated by the people of the United States, in spite of the fact that owing to the action of our enemies, understanding between the two peoples is rendered difficult."

It will be seen from this communication that the very sharpest conflict of opinion existed between the American and German Governments, and it was obvious that unless one side or the other made a concession of some kind the two nations would be brought at least to a diplomatic break and probably to actual war. The American Government did, indeed, attempt to induce the Entente Powers to agree not to arm merchantmen, but Great Britain and her Allies rejected this proposal, and President Wilson was not prepared to press his point of view on this matter, because America had been previously committed to the opinion that International Law permitted mercantile vessels to carry guns, provided the armament was of a strictly defensive character. It should be repeated that the controversy arose specifically over armed merchantmen, the German Government not contending that they had the right to treat unarmed ships in the same manner. It should also be explained that the American Government agreed with the German Government that the Allies really had violated some of the maritime rules of International Law, though they (the American Government) could not consider this fact as justifying what they regarded as the far more serious breach of International Law which the Berlin Administration now contemplated.

Mr. Wilson had no intention of moving in the matter so long as American lives were not lost in the new submarine campaign.

He did not think that the mere fact that belligerent merchantmen were sunk without warning, with the loss of lives of non-combatant citizens of belligerent states, or even with the loss of lives of neutrals other than Americans, warranted the American Government in sending an ultimatum to Berlin. He did not propose to make himself responsible for the safety of neutrals in general, but for that of Americans only. But, as might have been expected, it was not long before the occasion for a direct conflict arose.

On March 24 a German submarine torpedoed in the English Channel the French steamer *Sussex*, which was an unarmed passenger vessel carrying amongst other persons a number of American citizens, some of whom lost their lives. This incident brought the two great nations to the verge of war.

President Wilson immediately ordered an investigation into the affair, and sent inquiries to the German Government through Mr. Gerard, the American Ambassador at Berlin. The inquiries covered other less vital incidents, besides that of the *Sussex*, and on April 10 the German Government sent a statement in reply.

The statement covered the cases of the steamers *Sussex*, *Manchester Engineer*, *Englishman*, *Berwindvale*, and *Eagle Point*. According to the note a ship believed to be the *Berwindvale* had been sunk off the Irish coast on March 16, but not without warning, the crew being given time to take to the boats. Similarly in the case of the steamer *Englishman*, sunk on March 24, the vessel tried to escape and therefore was bombarded, but after she had stopped, time was given for the crew to take to the boats. In regard to the *Manchester Engineer*, the German Government knew nothing about the affair. The steamer *Eagle Point* was sunk on March 28, about 100 miles from the south-west coast of Ireland, but she was only fired at because she refused to stop, and when she ultimately did stop, time was given for the boats to be launched and cleared, before the ship was torpedoed. In regard to the much more crucial case of the *Sussex*, the German memorandum stated that the establishment of whether the Channel steamer *Sussex* was damaged by a German submarine or not is rendered extraordinarily difficult by the fact that no exact details of the place, time, or circumstances of the incident are known, and no picture of this vessel could be obtained. Hence all the operations which took place on March 24 between Folkestone and Dieppe had to be investigated. On March 24, in the middle of the English Channel, a long black vessel flying no flag, with a grey funnel, a small grey upper deck-house, and two high masts, was met by a German submarine. The German commander was firmly convinced that this was a war-vessel, namely, a mine-layer of the recently built British *Arabis* class. His conviction was supported by the fact that the vessel's build and painting were like that of a warship, by her high speed, and by

the unusual course she was steering for a merchantman. He therefore attacked her at 3.55 P.M. The torpedo caused such a violent explosion in the fore part of the ship that the whole of the bow as far as the bridge was blown off. The great violence of the explosion admits of the certain conclusion that great quantities of ammunition were on board. A sketch of the vessel made by the commander of the submarine and a picture of the *Sussex* from an English newspaper are appended for comparison, which show that the *Sussex* was not identical with the vessel attacked. No other attack was made at the place and time in question, and therefore the German Government supposes that the sinking of the *Sussex* must be attributed to some other cause. . . . The German Government asks for further material for the investigation, and declares its readiness to have the facts established by a mixed committee of inquiry in accordance with the Hague Convention.

The American reply to this was in the nature of an ultimatum, and for the space of about a week the eyes of the whole civilised world were turned away from the military operations, and were directed towards this new diplomatic crisis which threatened to change so dramatically the whole aspect of the war. The text of the American reply was published on April 25. The Note stated that there could be no doubt that the *Sussex* was torpedoed by a German submarine, this having been established by an impartial American investigation. The President then traced the whole history of this controversy with Germany, laying emphasis on the patience shown by the American Administration. He declared that the manner in which mercantile and passenger ships had been torpedoed without warning was regarded by the United States Government as "wanton and lacking every justification." He said that if these methods of warfare were continued there would be, deeply to the regret of the American Government, only one possible course for that Government to take. "If the Imperial Government should not now, without delay, proclaim and make effective renunciation of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and cargo ships, the United States Government can have no other choice than to break off completely diplomatic relations with the German Government." An appendix was added to the Note giving evidence relating to the *Sussex* case.¹

The Note was signed by Mr. Gerard. Great excitement and anxiety prevailed in the United States. On April 19 a joint session of the two Houses of Congress was held, and Mr. Wilson read a message explaining the purport of the Note which he was sending to the German Government. The greater part of this message was verbally identical with the Note itself, and therefore need not be repeated here, but the message ended as follows :—

¹ For the full text of the Note the reader is referred to the section "Public Documents," pp. 45-49.

"This decision"—the decision to threaten a severance of diplomatic relations—"I have arrived at with the keenest regret. The possibility of the action contemplated I am sure all thoughtful Americans look forward to with unaffected reluctance, but we cannot forget that we are, in some sort, and by the force of circumstances, responsible spokesmen of the rights of humanity. We cannot remain silent while those rights seem in process of being swept utterly away in the maelstrom of this terrible war. We owe it to the due regard of our own rights as a nation, to our sense of duty as a representative of the rights of neutrals the world over, and to a just conception of the rights of mankind to take this stand now.

"With the utmost solemnity and firmness I have taken it, and I have taken it in the confidence that it will meet with your approval and support. All sober-minded men must unite in hoping that Germany, which in other circumstances has stood as the champion for all we are now contending for in the interest of humanity, may recognise the justice of our demands, and meet them in the spirit in which they are made."

It was apparent during the next few days that Congress as a whole, and the majority of the American nation, stood behind the President. Americans were extremely averse from war, no less so than their President himself, whose peace-loving disposition was evident in almost every sentence of his Note. But they found themselves now in a position from which they deemed it impossible to recede. They waited in tense anxiety for the answer from Berlin, but they were prepared to face the ordeal, if that should be forced upon them. Criticism of Mr. Wilson was expressed in certain quarters, but this was not representative. Mr. Mann, the leader of the Opposition in the Lower House, accused the President of Anglophil sentiments, and of having exaggerated the crimes of Germany, whilst passing over lightly the serious breaches of International Law by Great Britain. Mr. Roosevelt characteristically blamed the President for not having taken a strong line earlier.

The chief opposition came, however, from Mr. Bryan and his following of pacifists, together with the German-Americans; and Mr. Bryan was active in Washington organising opposition in Congress, a fact which might have been of great importance if the German Government had forced the issue, because though the President of the United States can break off relations with any foreign Power on his own responsibility, he cannot declare war without the consent of Congress.

However, in the event the German Government did not press the issue. On the German side the decision in favour of a continuance of friendly relations was brought about by a victory of the Imperial Chancellor and his supporters as against the extreme chauvinists who were in favour of unrestricted and ruthless warfare (see Germany). The German reply to the American ultimatum was given to Mr. Gerard at the beginning

of May. The Note was of great length. It opened by virtually admitting that the vessel torpedoed on March 24 was the *Sussex*, and then stated that German submarines had instructions to act in accordance with the recognised principles of International Law, except in regard to "enemy freight-ships encountered in the war-zone around Great Britain." The German Government had, however, decided to make a "further concession." After much criticism of British "violations of International Law," the nature of this concession was made clear. The German Navy was to be ordered to conduct submarine operations in accordance with the recognised principles of International Law, and merchant vessels, both within and without the war-zone, were in future not to be sunk without warning or without saving human lives, unless the ship attempted to escape or offered resistance. In view of this concession the German Government hoped that the American Government would again attempt to induce Great Britain to wage war in accordance with International Law, but should the United States Government not succeed in persuading all the belligerents to observe the law of humanity, "then the German Government would be facing a new situation in which it must reserve for itself complete liberty of decision."¹

The American Note acknowledging the receipt of this German reply accepted the German declaration that the methods of submarine warfare practised from February, 1915, onwards were henceforth to be abandoned. The Note stated, however, that the American Government could not regard it as permissible that this abandonment should be contingent upon the result of American negotiations with other belligerents. In this manner war between the United States and Germany was avoided, and during the remainder of the year no equally serious crisis in the relations between the two countries occurred. After this crisis had passed, it was allowed to be understood that if the United States had been compelled to go to war with Germany, she would, nevertheless, not have become a member of the Entente group of Powers, but would have pursued a separate policy, and would have concluded peace "as soon as the rights of humanity had been secured."

As already stated, a very long diplomatic controversy took place between the United States and Great Britain not only on the question of the British seizure of neutral mails, but on the more general question of the British blockade as a whole, and its interference with trade between the United States and European neutrals. In November, 1915, the American Government had sent a Note complaining that the British (and French) naval authorities were acting in a manner contrary to the regulations of International Law, by taking neutral ships into port for purposes of examination and by seizing goods found in

¹This German Note is quoted verbatim under "Public Documents," pp. 49-53.

neutral ships and addressed to neutral consignees in neutral countries. The British reply to this Note set out very fully the conditions of modern naval warfare, and is interesting as throwing light upon the character of the blockade—by far the most important part of the sea-war—and also as explaining the natural, if not always very logical annoyance of neutrals.

The British memorandum in question, which was published on April 26, was of very great length, and it is only possible to give a much condensed summary of it here. Sir E. Grey commenced by saying that the American Note of November 5 had received the careful attention of the British Government in consultation with the French Government. Paragraphs (2) and (3) referred to the American contention that the methods used by Great Britain to prove the enemy destination of cargoes bound for neutral ports were "without justification," and the memorandum stated that clearly "new devices for despatching goods to the enemy must be met by new methods of applying the fundamental and acknowledged principle of the right to intercept such trade." Paragraph (4) stated that owing to the size of modern steamships and the fact that contraband intended for the enemy was often concealed in packages of innocent appearance, it was necessary to institute the practice of taking ships into port for examination, instead of examining them on the high seas. Paragraph (5) admits that in any cases wherein it might be possible to visit and search ships on the high seas this ought to be done. In paragraph (6) Sir E. Grey stated that the effect of the size and seaworthiness of merchant vessels upon their search at sea is essentially a technical question, and that he had accordingly obtained Sir John Jellicoe's opinion upon it. The Admiral's report was as follows: "It is undoubtedly the case that the size of modern vessels is one of the factors which renders search at sea far more difficult than in the days of smaller vessels. So far as I know it has never been contended that it is necessary to remove every package of a ship's cargo to establish the character and nature of her trade, etc., but it must be obvious that the larger the vessel and the greater the amount of cargo, the more difficult does examination at sea become, because more packages must be removed." The difficulties of examination, continues the Admiral, are greatly increased by the concealment of contraband in and under other goods. "I entirely dispute the contention, therefore, advanced in the American Note, that there is no difference between the search of a ship of 1,000 tons and one of 20,000 tons.¹ I am sure that the fallacy of the statement must be apparent to anyone who has ever carried out such a search at sea." The Admiral further states that the practice of German submarines of attacking merchant vessels, neutral as well as British, with-

¹ Readers who remember the astounding ignorance of maritime matters displayed at the American Inquiry into the sinking of the *Titanic* will not be surprised at finding American officials advancing this ludicrous argument.

out warning renders it necessary to take vessels into port for examination, and this procedure is therefore in the interests of the neutral ship herself. In paragraph (7) Sir John Jellicoe is quoted as saying that "the difference between the British and the German procedure is that we have acted in the way which causes the least discomfort to neutrals. Instead of sinking neutral ships engaged in trade with the enemy, as the Germans have done in so many cases in direct contravention of Article 113 of their own Naval Prize Regulations, 1909, in which it is laid down that the commander is only justified in destroying a neutral ship which has been captured if (a) she is liable to condemnation, (b) the bringing in might expose the warship to danger or imperil the success of the operations in which she is engaged at the time ;¹ we examine them, giving as little inconvenience as modern naval conditions will allow, sending them into port only when this becomes necessary." The Admiral concludes by remarking that the Germans also take vessels into port when the opportunity occurs. Paragraph (8) stated that the French Ministry of Marine agreed with Sir John Jellicoe. Paragraph (9) stated that in any case the locality of the search was a matter of detail, the right of a belligerent to intercept contraband being in principle incontestable. In the next few paragraphs the memorandum entered into the subject of Prize Courts, and explained that the alterations recently made in the British regulations governing Prize Courts were not a violation of International Law, since International Law did not govern this question, the procedure of Prize Courts being a matter which each nation decided, and was entitled to decide, for itself. Paragraph (15) was interesting and pertinent, and stated that "the contention advanced by the United States Government in paragraph (9) of their Note that the effect of this new procedure is to subject traders to risk of loss, delay, and expense so great and so burdensome as practically to destroy much of the export trade of the United States to neutral countries in Europe is not borne out by the official statistics published in the United States—nor by the reports of the Department of Commerce." The first nine months of 1915 may be taken as a period when the war conditions must have been known to all those engaged in commerce in the United States of America, and when any injurious effects of the Prize Court procedure would have been recognised. During that period the exports from the United States of America to the three Scandinavian countries and Holland, the group of neutral countries whose imports have been most affected by the naval operations of the Allies and by the procedure adopted in their Prize Courts, amounted to 274,037,000 dollars as compared to 126,763,000 dollars in the corresponding period of 1913. It is useless to take into account the corresponding figures of 1914 because of

¹ The Germans did in fact excuse their submarine activities on this very ground.

the dislocation of trade caused by the outbreak of war, but taking the pre-war months of 1914, the figures for 1913, 1914, and 1915 were as follows:—

1913	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	97,480,000	dollars
1914	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88,132,000	"
1915	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	284,960,000	"

Paragraph (16) stated that in view of such figures it appeared impossible to accept the contention that the new Prize Court regulations had practically destroyed much of the export trade of the United States to neutral countries in Europe. Paragraph (17) stated that British trade to neutral countries adjacent to Germany had also been greatly reduced, as a matter of course. Paragraphs (18), (19), and (20) dealt with the question of the so-called "common stock" of merchandise in neutral countries, that is, merchandise which might or might not be ultimately exported to enemy countries, but which was at all events definitely consigned to the neutral country in the first instance. With regard to this, the British Note contended that cases in which goods were ostensibly designed to be part of the common stock of a neutral country adjacent to Germany must be investigated with extreme care. In paragraphs (21) and (22) it is explained that all kinds of devices were customarily adopted in order to get goods through the Allied Fleets, many of the consignees in neutral ports, especially Swedish ports, often being humble individuals who had never previously been importers of the goods concerned, whilst in other cases the consignees had no real existence. Paragraph (23) therefore states the important general conclusion that "in the presence of facts such as those indicated above, the United States Government will, it is believed, agree with His Majesty's Government that no belligerent could in modern times submit to be bound by a rule that no goods could be seized unless they were accompanied by papers which established their destination to an enemy country, and that all detentions of ships and goods must uniformly be based on proofs obtained at the time of seizure. To press any such theory is tantamount to asking that all trade between neutral ports shall be free and would thus render nugatory the exercise of sea power and destroy the pressure which the command of the sea enables the Allies to impose upon their enemy." After this important declaration, paragraphs (24) and (25) called attention to the fact that the situation was parallel to that existing in the American Civil War, when the Federals blockaded the South, and extended the doctrine of "continuous voyage," in order to stop goods going in through neutral ports of access. Paragraph (26) noted, as an instance of the evident passage of goods through neutral territory to Germany, the vast increase of the Swedish imports of lard in 1915. Paragraphs (27), (28), and (29) pointed out that the total net imports of a given article of a neutral country during peace indicated with accuracy the requirements of that country, and hence the British Government were taking

steps to limit the imports of each neutral nation contiguous to Germany to the real requirements, for purposes of home consumption, of each such country, as ascertained in this manner. Paragraphs (30) and (31) further explained the agreements with the neutral nations and firms, and the Prize Court regulations, which were being made to effect this purpose. Paragraphs (32), (33), (34), and (35) dealt with the American contention that the Allied blockade was illegal because it was not "effective." The Note asserted that the number of ships which got through the cordon was small in proportion to the number detained, and in regard to the inability of the Allies to blockade the Baltic coast of Germany, and their consequent powerlessness to prevent overseas trade between Scandinavia and Germany, the Note maintained that if it were admitted that it was legitimate to stop commerce with Germany, even though that commerce was going to Germany through a neutral port, it was difficult to see why it should be held that the interposition of a few miles of sea made any difference. Paragraph (36) explained that the reason why cotton had been recently declared contraband was, not that such a declaration would render the prevention of cotton passing any more complete, but that it might in future be confiscated and not merely stopped and restored to the owners. Paragraphs (37) and (38) dealt with the American contention that the Allied measures in question were "admittedly retaliatory and therefore illegal." The Note asserted that in fact it was not admitted that the measures passed the bounds fixed by International Law, but even if they did so, the principle of retaliation was recognised by International Law. If one belligerent broke any given International Law, then the opposing belligerent was at liberty to do the same, even though neutrals might incidentally be adversely affected thereby. The German Government itself was in agreement with the British Government on this point, since the German Government, when announcing the new form of submarine war on February 4, 1915, justified this measure as a retaliation for the alleged infringements of International Maritime Law by Great Britain. Paragraphs (39) to (44) dealt with the means of redress which United States citizens and other neutrals possessed when they had suffered, or believed themselves to have suffered, unjustifiable injury or loss through the maritime activities of the Allies. The Note explained here that it was not the case that British Prize Courts merely applied the "municipal" regulations of Great Britain, but that on the contrary on certain points they were specifically empowered to apply International Law, and to say whether a given Admiralty action was in accordance with International Law, and if the action were not so, to disallow it on that account. The Courts were thus a protection to neutrals, and the British Government expected neutrals to apply to the Prize Courts before resorting to diplomatic action. Paragraph (45) referred to four cases which arose during the American Civil War, namely, the cases

of the *Magicienne*, *Don José*, *Labuan*, and *Saxon*, which the British Note contended established the principle that Prize Courts should be applied to before any claims ought to be made through diplomatic channels. The next few paragraphs dealt with minor points of procedure, such as the imposition of charges upon ships whose cargoes were released, and the claims to compensation made by owners of ships whose cargoes were released. In paragraphs (49) and (50) the Note reaffirmed the desire of the Allied Governments to cause neutrals as little inconvenience as possible, but stated also that if the changes advocated by America were adopted, that is, visiting exclusively at sea and not intercepting goods notoriously destined for the enemy if they happened to be carried by a neutral ship and addressed to a neutral consignee, then obviously the Allies would not be able to persist effectively in their attempt to deprive the enemy of the resources which he required to prosecute the war. The last paragraph, number (51), stated that the British Government were glad to hear that the United States intended to champion the integrity of neutral rights, and called attention to the violations of International Law by Germany and Austria-Hungary, and finally concluded by saying that "His Majesty's Government would welcome any combination of neutral nations under the lead of the United States which would exert an effective influence to prevent the violation of neutral rights, and they cannot believe that they or their Allies have much to fear from any combination for the protection of those rights which takes an impartial and comprehensive view of the conduct of this war, and judges it by a reasonable interpretation of the generally accepted provisions of International Law and by the rules of humanity that have hitherto been approved by the civilised world."

An appendix was added to this Note giving details of the four cases of ships seized during the American Civil War—the vessels named *Magicienne*, the *Don José*, the *Labuan*, and the *Saxon*—which cases the British Government believed (as mentioned above) bore out their contentions.

Other controversies with Great Britain on less general questions, such as the seizure of mails, to which reference has already been made, and the British "black lists" of American firms trading with Germans (see British History) continued throughout the year.

The condition of Mexico was a constant source of trouble to the American Administration, but Mr. Wilson's avoidance of war was approved by public opinion as a whole—although Mr. Roosevelt accused the President of "weakness" (see Mexico).

In the domestic history of the United States the first place must be given, of course, to the Presidential Election. The situation was one of great interest. Mr. Wilson had been elected in 1912 on a minority vote, and owed his success entirely to the secession of the so-called Progressives, the followers of ex-President Roosevelt, from the orthodox Republican party. The

triangular contest had brought about a Democratic victory, which under simpler and more normal conditions would have been impossible. Early in the year it appeared very possible that Mr. Roosevelt would again take the field as Progressive candidate, but even on the assumption that a reunion of the Republicans and Progressives took place (as it ultimately did take place), the result of the election was admittedly doubtful in the highest degree. Mr. Wilson's prestige had been greatly enhanced during his term of office, and even his critics now admitted that he had good prospects of re-election, even on a "straight fight" between Republicans and Democrats. The first stage of every Presidential contest is fought, of course, in the National Conventions of the great political parties, and these were held in June. The proceedings of the Democratic Convention, which was held at St. Louis, were not of a very exciting character, since there was no serious competition for the candidature. Dr. Wilson was the only possible candidate, and he was adopted by acclamation on June 15. Mr. Thomas R. Marshall was also renominated as candidate for the Vice-Presidency. The programme of the Democrats comprised the same principles that the party had adopted and defended during the previous four years, such as relatively low tariffs, war on "graft" and on the great trusts, a very moderate armaments programme, and an unaggressive foreign policy, the Left wing of the Democrats being pacifist in tendency.

The Republican and Progressive Conventions, both of which were held at Chicago in June, were much more dramatic in character. Mr. Roosevelt decided in April to accept the proposal of his supporters to attempt to nominate him as candidate, not of the Progressive but of the regular Republican party. Both the Republicans and the Progressives were anxious to avoid any repetition of the mistake which they had made four years before, and thus Mr. Roosevelt made the attempt to regain the support of the orthodox Republicans, whilst reserving to himself the right to stand as Progressive nominee if he failed to obtain nomination as Republican candidate. Mr. Roosevelt stood for a policy of high protection and greatly increased armaments. He was also an advocate of a foreign policy much less pacific than that of Dr. Wilson, and he was a somewhat extreme member of the influential, if not very numerous, pro-British party in America. It was universally held that the election of Mr. Roosevelt to the Presidency would greatly increase the risk of war with Germany. The proceedings at the Republican Convention proved, however, that this party had not forgiven him for the schism which he had caused at the previous election, and that Republicans generally disliked his chauvinism. The third candidate, whose chances had to be regarded seriously, was Judge Hughes, of the Supreme Court, the nominee of the Republican party.

The Republicans introduced an innovation into the constitu-

tion of their Convention. Hitherto the representation of the States in the Convention had been based (as in the Democratic Convention) on population, but this year the representation of the Southern States was reduced, on the ground that in spite of their large population they brought little real strength to the Republican party, because these States were overwhelmingly Democratic. Mr. Justice Hughes had been Governor of New York, and he was known as a man of the very highest integrity. His policy was akin to that of Mr. Roosevelt in domestic politics, but in foreign policy he was much less chauvinistic. The result of the voting in the Convention was a striking victory for the moderate man. Of the 899 members of the Convention, only eighty-one voted for Mr. Roosevelt, and thus Mr. Hughes was duly elected as Republican candidate. Mr. Hughes, on hearing that he had been selected, telegraphed accepting the nomination, and resigned his seat on the Bench.

Mr. Hughes having been selected as the Republican candidate, it only remained for Mr. Roosevelt to decide whether he would avail himself of the opportunity, which he undoubtedly possessed, of becoming the candidate of the "Progressive" malcontents. Mr. Roosevelt and the leading Progressives realised, however, that they would have no chance of success against either of the two greater parties, and, indeed, that the only possible result of a Progressive intervention would be to make the election of Mr. Wilson certain. The Progressive Convention at Chicago therefore decided not to run a candidate.

The issues at stake in the elections cannot be said to have been of fundamental importance. In foreign politics there was no essential difference between Mr. Hughes and Mr. Wilson, since each represented the moderates within his own party. Nor did the differences in regard to internal affairs involve any serious conflict of principles. The election campaign was, therefore, not very momentous, and it was, happily, completely devoid of disagreeable personalities, at least so far as the principals and their chief supporters were concerned. Both parties having chosen candidates who were serious, responsible, dignified statesmen, each worthy to be at the head of the greatest democracy in history, the contest was kept on a very high level of controversy.

If, however, the issues involved were not of great historic importance, the election, as a mere election, was of an extraordinarily exciting character. Up to the appointed day, and, as will be seen, even after the day, no man could predict which candidate would be successful.

The elections took place, as always, on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November, which fell this year on the seventh day of the month. A new feature in the elections was the number of women voters, Illinois and eleven Western States having adopted Woman Suffrage. There were about 2,000,000 female voters on the register, 600,000 being in Illinois. It was sup-

posed that the contest would turn on the vote of a few large "doubtful" States, especially New York and Illinois (possessing forty-five and twenty-nine votes in the Electoral College respectively), since many of the States were notoriously either Republican or Democratic. The old Southern States were certain to support Dr. Wilson, and most of the New England States were equally reliable supporters of Mr. Hughes.

The result, however, falsified most of the predictions in regard to the distribution of the votes of the States. Mr. Hughes won both New York and Illinois. The entire American public were so impressed with this, that it was confidently announced on November 8 that Mr. Hughes had been elected, and even the Democratic newspapers admitted that this must be so. The results from the Western States are always known later, however, and as these began to come in it became apparent that in the West and Middle West there had been a veritable avalanche in favour of the Democrats. It was known that the West was strongly pacifist in sentiment, and had therefore been influenced both by Dr. Wilson's avoidance of war and still more by the arguments of Mr. Bryan and the Radical wing of the Democrats, but the great strength of this peace-sentiment had not been realised in the Eastern States. On November 9 the result was clearly doubtful; and ultimately Dr. Wilson won by a small majority of votes in the Electoral College, 276 to 255.

The following States voted for Dr. Wilson, their number of votes in the Electoral College being given in brackets: Alabama (12), Arizona (3), Arkansas (9), California (13), Colorado (6), Florida (6), Georgia (14), Idaho (4), Kansas (10), Kentucky (13), Louisiana (10), Maryland (8), Mississippi (10), Missouri (18), Montana (4), Nebraska (8), Nevada (3), N. Carolina (12), N. Dakota (5), New Hampshire (4), New Mexico (3), Ohio (24), Oklahoma (10), S. Carolina (9), Tennessee (12), Texas (20), Utah (4), Virginia (12), Washington (7), Wyoming (3).

And the remaining States voted for Mr. Hughes, their number of votes being as shown: Connecticut (7), Delaware (3), Illinois (29), Indiana (15), Iowa (13), Maine (6), Massachusetts (18), Michigan (15), Minnesota (12), New Jersey (14), New York (45), Oregon (5), Pennsylvania (38), Rhode Island (5), S. Dakota (5), Vermont (4), W. Virginia (8), Wisconsin (13).

Mr. Wilson's popular majority was only 400,000. The Socialists ran a candidate, as usual, but (also as usual) the number of Socialist votes was relatively very small. The parliamentary elections synchronised, of course, with the Presidential Election. The Democrats retained a majority in the Senate, but to the House of Representatives the two great parties were returned in almost equal strength, the balance thus being held by the few independent members. Montana had the distinction of returning the first woman member to Congress, Miss Jeanette Rankin. Early in the election campaign it was thought that the German-American votes would be cast almost

unanimously against President Wilson, owing to his antagonism to Germany on the submarine issue, but in the event the "German" vote was divided, the fact that Mr. Roosevelt was supporting Mr. Hughes being sufficient to deter many of the German electors from giving any aid to the Republicans.

Throughout the year an organisation called "The League to Enforce Peace" attracted much attention. Although large numbers of Americans were indifferent to, or at least aloof from, the struggle in Europe, there was a distinct development of a different spirit in many thoughtful circles, a sentiment unlike the old spirit of American isolation. Whilst no true Americans desired to be partisans in any mere European quarrel, a feeling was growing that the United States had responsibilities towards humanity at large which she ought not to shirk. It began to be propounded that permanent peace the world over ought to be secured by the collective guarantee of all civilised nations. It was this principle, the theory of compulsory arbitration in cases of international disputes, which the new League to Enforce Peace was founded to advocate. At the end of May, Dr. Wilson delivered an important address before this league. He dealt at length with the great war then raging and with the problems of peace and war in general. With the causes and objects of the present war, America had, he said, no concern. But her own rights and privileges were affected by the warfare, and she was as much concerned as the belligerents to see that the peace, when it came, should assume an aspect of permanence. Americans, said the President, believed in certain fundamental political principles, such as the right of any people to choose the sovereignty under which it should live, the liberty of small nations, and the right of the world to be freed from fear of a disturbance of peace due to the aggression of any Power. Americans held these principles with such sincerity that the President was, he said, certain that he was speaking for his countrymen when he declared that "the United States is willing to become a partner in any feasible association of nations formed in order to realise these objects and make them secure against violation."

This declaration found favour in many quarters, but in others, more conservative, it was condemned as a proposal to engage in one of those "entangling alliances" which it was the traditional policy of the United States to eschew. In truth, however, the new proposal had little in common with any partial policy of alliances.

The financial condition of the American people remained extremely satisfactory. The expenditure of the Federal Government was increasing, but the growing wealth of the people enabled them to bear easily these increases. The national expenditure for the year ending June 30, 1916, was 716,367,674 dollars, and the revenue was 777,480,487 dollars. The revenue was the highest ever recorded, but the expenditure was about

8,000,000 dollars below that of the previous year. Many Americans made handsome profits from the armament business, and in the matter of the sale of munitions, the United States afforded enormous assistance to the Entente Powers. Thus in the second half of the year 1915 the United States exported to the Entente countries arms and goods classed as "mainly suitable for war supplies" to the value of no less than 85,000,000%.

In July Congress adopted a scheme for a considerable expansion of the Navy. The programme provided for the construction of four "Dreadnought" battleships and four battle-cruisers, besides minor craft, during the next three years, and over 60,000,000% was to be spent in the first year alone. Up to this date the American fleet included no battle-cruisers. The construction of the eight capital ships was advertised to begin at once, but in fact no serious progress with the work had been made by the end of the year.

The most important change in the personnel of the Federal Administration was the retirement of the War Secretary, Mr. L. M. Garrison, in February. He was succeeded by Mr. Newton D. Baker, who had been Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio.

During the summer keen sympathy was felt in America for the Irish rebels, and on July 29 the Senate passed a resolution expressing the hope that the British Government would exercise clemency in the treatment of these men.

On December 5 the President read his message to Congress, which was of a very unsensational character, and dealt mainly with proposed legislation relating to railways.

At the end of the year, Dr. Wilson attracted the attention of the whole world by suddenly intervening diplomatically in the great war. On December 20 the President addressed a Peace Note to all the belligerent Powers, the main object of which was to request them to state in definite language the aims for which they were fighting and the terms on which they would consent to make peace. The Note to Great Britain began by stating that the suggestions were offered in the most friendly manner, and that the move was in no way connected with the recent peace proposal of the Central Powers. "The President suggests that an early occasion be sought to call out from all the nations now at war such an avowal of their respective views as to the terms upon which the war might be concluded and the arrangements which would be deemed satisfactory as a guarantee against its renewal or the kindling of any similar conflict in the future as would make it possible frankly to compare them." Dr. Wilson "called attention to the fact that the objects which the statesmen of the belligerents on both sides have in mind in this war are virtually the same, as stated in general terms to their own people and to the world." Each side, continued the President, desired to see small nations made secure against aggression; each desired itself to be secure, and

would be jealous of the formation of any more rival leagues to preserve an uncertain balance of power; but each was ready to consider the formation of a league of all nations to preserve peace throughout the world; but, again, each deemed it necessary first to decide the issues of the present war, before considering any world-league. Dr. Wilson declared that the United States and other neutrals were deeply interested in the termination of the war, and no less interested than the belligerents in the maintenance of future peace. He emphasised the terrible evils of the conflict, and of the idea of a war of attrition, and said that in the continuance of the war there was risk that "an injury be done to civilisation itself which can never be atoned or repaired." The Note ended by again calling upon the belligerents to state their peace-terms in definite language.

Similar Notes were sent by the American President to all the belligerent Powers. The reply of the Central Powers is summarised elsewhere. That of the Entente had not been delivered at the end of the year.

II. CANADA.

The history of the greatest of the Oversea Dominions in 1916 reveals many points of interest, although the country was not, like Australia, the scene of a momentous political battle between two conceptions of empire, two theories of Britannic unity. In Canada there could be no such battle, because the electors as a whole were firmly rooted in the main principles of historic Liberalism and of Colonial freedom, and any attempt on the part of the extreme imperialists to carry the nation in another direction would have been foredoomed to failure.

Nevertheless, in her own way Canada was very active in the cause which the British Empire had adopted, and the opening of the New Year was signalised in a striking manner by Sir Robert Borden, the Premier, who announced that the establishment of the Canadian Foreign Service Army would be forthwith raised from a quarter of a million to half a million men. The step was a bold and ambitious one, for the number of Canadian soldiers at the beginning of January was only 212,000. The Prime Minister announced this step in a message to the Canadian people, in which he also affirmed the intention of the Canadian Government and nation to fight the war out, no matter how heavy the sacrifice, until victory had been won and an enduring peace secured by the reduction of Germany to military impotence.

The Dominion Parliament was opened for preliminary business, including the election of a new Speaker of the House of Commons (Mr. Albert Seigney, the member for Dorchester), on January 14, but the formal opening by the Governor-General, the Duke of Connaught, did not take place until the following day. The Duke's Speech from the Throne forecasted only two

important measures, these being the extension of the life of Parliament for one year and a Bill to provide for greater armaments. The Speech also mentioned the fact that 120,000 Canadian soldiers had already left the country for the seat of war, and that nearly an equal number were in training at home. The Premier's announcement of a half-million army had been received with enthusiasm, and volunteers were pouring in. The previous harvest had, the Speech concluded, been excellent, and the general prosperity of the country was remarkable.

On February 15 the Dominion Minister of Finance, Mr. Thomas White, delivered his Budget speech, which under the circumstances existing could not, of course, be satisfactory. The additional taxation recently imposed had, he explained, yielded more than had been anticipated, and the revenue for the year 1915-16 would be 34,000,000*l.* instead of the 30,000,000*l.* which had been estimated. Apart from the war expenditure the position of the national finances was satisfactory. The speaker referred to the fact that in the previous November when the Government had issued a war-loan of 10,000,000*l.* at 97½ in the shape of 10 year bonds yielding 5 per cent., the sum required had been subscribed twice over. Accordingly, the second 10,000,000*l.* had been placed to the credit of the British Government for the purpose of purchasing munitions in Canada. On March 31, it was expected, said the Minister, that the National Debt would amount altogether to 116,000,000*l.*, which would be an increase of 26,000,000*l.* in the financial year.¹ The total trade for the year would amount to about 240,000,000*l.* Although the greater part of the burden of the war expenditure must be placed upon their children and grandchildren, some part of the military expenditure would be met by taxation. The previous year's estimates had allowed for an army of 100,000 men, but the troops raised already numbered 250,000, and it was hoped that before long Canada would possess an army of 500,000 men, so that the House must be prepared to sanction higher taxation.

Further particulars of the Canadian finances may be added here. The total cost of the war during the financial year ending March 31, 1916, was \$150,000,000., of which less than \$7,000,000 had been met out of revenue. The total cost of the war from August 4, 1914, to March 31, 1916, had been \$213,000,000. The anticipated expenditure for the year 1916-17 was, of course, much greater, and although the part played by Canada in the war was relatively, as well as actually small compared to the efforts of Great Britain and France, yet the national debt of the North American Dominion was being most seriously increased. Of the new taxes imposed the most important were those on profits, the alterations in the tariff not being large. Thus the new law compelled all incorporated companies to pay

¹ It may be noted that this is equivalent to an increase of only 150,000,000*l.* in the debt of the United Kingdom, allowing for the proportionate populations.

a tax of 25 per cent. on all profits exceeding 7 per cent., and similarly in the case of ordinary partnerships and private individuals 25 per cent. of all profits above 10 per cent. had to be made over to the state. Certain forms of industry were exempted from these new taxes, however, the most important exemption being agriculture in all its varieties; and the law did not apply to companies with a capital of less than \$50,000. The ordinary expenditure of the Dominion for the financial year then forthcoming, that is 1916-17, was estimated at 27,000,000*l.*, and the capital expenditure, other than that on the war, at 6,000,000*l.* No reliable estimate could be given of the prospective war expenditure, but at the beginning of May Sir Robert Borden asked the House of Commons to vote 50,000,000*l.* for war purposes, and he had the satisfaction of seeing his resolution carried unanimously.

On February 3 a disastrous event occurred, the Dominion Parliament Buildings at Ottawa being almost completely destroyed by fire. Fortunately but few Members were in the building at the time and only about half a dozen lives were lost, these including, however, two lady guests of the Speaker of the House of Commons. The origin of the fire was unknown, but many persons suspected incendiarism by German sympathisers.

Shortly after this, the two great parties agreed to extend the life of the Dominion Parliament by one year, a general election (which would under normal conditions have been due) being deemed undesirable during the war. This truce by no means extended to the provincial legislatures, however. For instance, in April the Legislative Assembly of Quebec was dissolved by the Lieutenant-Governor, although a general election was not necessarily due until 1917, and the elections were fixed for May 22. The result was a most extraordinary victory for the Liberals, who increased their already large majority. The Quebec Assembly possessed 81 seats, and of these the Conservatives won only 7. The election in the French province turned very largely upon the vexed question of the bilingual schools in Ontario, the Liberals of Quebec as well as those of Ontario holding that the Ontario Government had handicapped the French language in these schools in a grossly unfair and indeed scandalous manner. The Quebec Government had proposed legislation conferring upon municipalities the power to vote money in support of the political campaign against the educational regulations of the Ontario Government, and this had been strongly opposed by the Conservative Opposition. The Conservatives, led by Mr. Cousineau, held that this was an undesirable interference in the affairs of another province, and that, in any case, it was most improper for municipalities to be allowed to levy rates in support of what was essentially the cause of a political party. The feeling amongst French Canadians was intense, however, and Mr. Cousineau went down with his party, being defeated at Jacques Cartier by 900 votes.

This question of the bilingual schools of Ontario attracted more attention in the Dominion than any other problem of domestic politics. The majority of the Roman Catholic "separate" schools in Ontario were bilingual, French as well as English being used in them as a medium of communication and instruction. Now in 1913 the Education Department of the Ontario Government had issued a circular restricting the use of French as a medium of instruction in these schools to Form I., although certain unimportant exceptions to this rule were allowed. In all forms above the lowest, English was to be the sole medium of instruction. It was this circular which raised the storm of indignation among French Canadians. The circular, it should be noted, in no way affected denominational religious teaching. The Trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools of the city of Ottawa refused to obey the circular, and even went so far as to close all the schools under their control. Prolonged litigation followed in the Ontario law-courts, judgment being uniformly given against the Trustees. The latter persevered, however. They held that this restriction of the use of French was a violation of the terms of the British North America Act, 1867, and that the Ontario Government therefore possessed no legal power to issue the regulations. The controversy dragged on for more than three years, the Trustees ultimately appealing to the imperial authority in the shape of the Privy Council. On November 2 the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council delivered judgment on the matter. It was declared that the provincial Government possessed the power to direct in what language education should be given, and the appeal of the Trustees was therefore dismissed. Since the circular did not restrict the rights of denominational religious teaching it was not illegal. A second case connected with the first was also heard by the Privy Council. This related to an Act passed in the meantime by the Ontario legislature restricting the powers of the Trustees. The Privy Council held that this Act was *ultra vires*, since it withdrew privileges secured to the Trustees by the British North America Act. It will be seen, however, that on the more important point—the point which gave rise to the whole dispute—judgment went against the Trustees and in favour of the Ontario Government.

Similar regulations to those put into force in Ontario were promulgated in Manitoba, but in the latter province the problem of bilingual schools was of much smaller magnitude.

In October a special letter from the Pope, dealing with this question, was published in the Roman Catholic newspapers. The Pontiff exhorted both the English-speaking and French-speaking sections of his flock in Canada not to allow the contentions in regard to the language difficulty to divide them from one another, and to remember that the thing which was, from their point of view, of supreme importance was to have Catholic schools.

It was not only in Quebec that a general election was held. Elections also took place in Nova Scotia and in British Columbia, and in both these provinces the Liberals were victorious. In the Pacific province, where the contests took place in September, the Conservative defeat was scarcely less crushing than in Quebec, for that party secured only 10 seats out of 47. The Liberal victories in Quebec and Nova Scotia were less remarkable than this success in British Columbia, because those two eastern provinces are normally Liberal strongholds. The circumstances in British Columbia were altogether different. The previous legislature in that province had been overwhelmingly Conservative, and the result of the election was thus a severe blow to the Conservative Premier, Mr. W. J. Bowser. The new Liberal Prime Minister was Mr. H. C. Brewster. As will be seen, the indications were that when a federal general election was held, the prospects of the Conservative Administration of Sir Robert Borden would be far from bright.

The movement in favour of Woman Suffrage continued to make rapid progress in certain provinces. In Manitoba, where the Liberals had been victorious in a general election in the previous year, the legislature passed a measure endowing women with the vote. A similar Act was passed by the Alberta diet in March.

In Western Canada and in Ontario the advocates of the prohibition of alcohol were very successful in their propaganda. In Manitoba a referendum on the subject of prohibition was held on March 13, and the result was in favour of prohibition by 48,769 votes to 24,491. In Alberta a similar referendum had been held in 1915, and the Act carrying out the verdict of the voters was passed during the spring session. In Saskatchewan liquor could only be obtained through Government-owned dispensaries. In British Columbia a plebiscite on the matter was held at the same time as the general election, and gave a verdict in favour of the change. Finally, in the greatest province, Ontario, the Government brought in and Parliament passed a drastic measure of prohibition.

On September 2, the Duke of Connaught relaid the cornerstone of the Parliament House at Ottawa. In the autumn the Duke of Connaught's term of office as Governor-General came to a close, and he was succeeded by the Duke of Devonshire.

During the last few months of the year desperate efforts were made to secure recruits for the Canadian Army, whose strength was still much below its rather extravagant establishment of half a million men. Great pressure, both legitimate and illegitimate, was brought to bear upon young men to induce them to join. An extreme instance of this pressure was afforded by the announcement made in November by the Federal Government that young men who had neither volunteered for the army nor been engaged in national work deemed essential by the authorities would henceforth be debarred from entering the

Civil Service. The total strength of the Army at the end of the year was about 380,000. The volunteers had been secured almost exclusively from the English-speaking section of the population. Amongst French Canadians the volunteers numbered less than 1 per cent. of the population. The total Canadian casualties up to the end of August were 38,000; and up to the end of November, 66,000. On November 14, it was announced that Sir Sam Hughes, Minister of Militia, had resigned. The Minister was in conflict with Sir Robert Borden on various points, and had not approved of the treatment of Canadian troops by the Imperial authorities. He was succeeded by Mr. A. E. Kemp.

Another Canadian War Loan for 20,000,000*l.* was issued in September, and more than double the amount was subscribed.

III. NEWFOUNDLAND.

The year saw no development in the most serious issue in Newfoundland politics, that is, the relations of the Colony with the Canadian Federation. The question of a great reorganisation of the British Empire after the war was much discussed during the year, but it was significant that Newfoundland as an independent unit was scarcely ever mentioned in these discussions. Few writers, if any, referred to this Colony as a coequal partner with the four great Dominions, and it was almost universally assumed that Newfoundland would ultimately take the natural course made ready for her by the British North America Act and become a Canadian province.

A battalion of the Newfoundland regiment served in France throughout the summer, and passed through some of the most severe fighting. The battalion was kept up to full strength by means of steady drafts from the Colony, these always being available in the required numbers. In May, Sir E. P. Morris, the Prime Minister, came to England and visited the troops of his Colony at the Front in France.

A useful and very necessary Act was passed by the legislature in June, by which restrictions were placed upon the killing of seals in Newfoundland waters. The object of the Act was to prevent the extermination of these useful animals. The sealing season was this year very successful, although only twelve vessels took part in the hunting. About 243,000 seals were caught, their total value being reckoned at over 200,000*l.*

At the end of December, 1916, total prohibition of alcohol, which had been decreed by plebiscite in the previous year, was put into force throughout Newfoundland and Labrador.

IV. MEXICO.

Mexico, once the leading State of Latin America, but in recent years reduced to a condition of complete anarchy, began the year in conditions slightly better than those existing twelve

months earlier. General Carranza, recently leader of the so-called Constitutional faction, had established some semblance of a central Government in Mexico city, and he had been recognised by the United States Government as *de facto* President of Mexico. Nevertheless, General Carranza's control of the republic was very imperfect. Large districts were still without any effective police-control, and Carranza's erstwhile rival for the leadership of the Constitutionalists, the blood-stained ruffian General Villa, roamed about the wilder parts of northern Mexico with a large following of armed men. This General Villa was no better than a magnified bandit, and he and his followers lived by wholesale robbery and terrorism. Serious complications arose in March, when a body of Villa's bandits made a raid across the United States frontier. On March 9 about 1,500 armed men rode across into the State of New Mexico and seized the town of Columbus. It was reported that the little army was led by Villa himself. The town was raided and many buildings were set on fire before the Mexicans were driven out by a small force of American cavalry which arrived on the scene. During the fighting nine American troopers were killed, and others were wounded. Moreover, whilst in the town the bandits murdered eleven American civilians. The United States executive naturally took a grave view of this incident, and Dr. Wilson announced at once that a force would be dispatched into Mexico to punish General Villa. The difficulty involved in this course of action was that it might give offence to many Mexicans other than Villa's brigands. Most Mexicans harboured a traditional dislike of Americans, and the sight of foreign troops operating on Mexican territory would not be pleasing to them. Dr. Wilson was careful, however, to do all in his power to avoid wounding the susceptibilities of the Mexican Government and the relatively law-abiding section of the Mexican people. General Carranza telegraphed his regrets for the incident, and an amicable arrangement was reached by which American troops were permitted to cross the frontier in pursuit of bandits, on the basis of a reciprocal permission to Mexican troops to do the same in corresponding circumstances, Mexican dignity thus being saved. The agreement, which it must be admitted had a somewhat humorous aspect, was worded as follows: "The United States grants permission for military forces of the *de facto* Government of Mexico to cross the international boundary in pursuit of lawless bands of armed men who have entered Mexico from the United States, committed outrages on Mexican soil, and fled into the United States, on the understanding that the *de facto* Government of Mexico grants the reciprocal privilege that the military forces of the United States may pursue across the international boundary into Mexican territory lawless bands of armed men who have entered the United States from Mexico, committed outrages on American soil, and fled into Mexico." On March 15 it was announced that an American force under the

command of General Pershing had crossed the border, and having united with a Carranzista force, was in full pursuit of Villa. On March 29 a flying column of American cavalry came up with a portion of Villa's band at Guerrero, and inflicted severe punishment upon the marauders, and also captured two machine-guns. More than thirty bandits were killed, whilst the only American casualties were four troopers slightly wounded.

The presence in Mexico of General Pershing's force was, however, a constant source of irritation even to the more law-abiding Mexicans. Thus on April 12 a small American force of cavalry was attacked in the town of Parral, in the State of Chihuahua, by unruly Carranzista soldiers, several Americans and about a hundred Mexicans being killed in the affray. The whole of the minute Mexican mobile army of 40,000 men was placed upon a war-footing, and the militia was called up in the border States. Notes were exchanged between General Carranza and Mr. Lansing, the American Secretary of State, but war, which both sides were anxious to avoid, did not ensue. A still more serious fight occurred between Americans and Carranzistas on June 21 at Carrizal, the Mexican commander, General Gomez, being killed. The situation was such that General Pershing did not dare to penetrate further into the country in order to catch General Villa, lest he should thereby become seriously involved with the Carranzistas. After much negotiation a joint Mexican and United States Commission met at New London, Connecticut, and sat for the last four months of the year. At the end of the year the Commission had not quite completed its deliberations, but it became known that the withdrawal of General Pershing's force had been arranged. At the end of the year, therefore, Villa was still at large in Chihuahua.

Large parts of the country had become less disorderly, however, and on September 1 the Government handed over the Mexican Railway to the Directors of the Company. The Government had been obliged to manage the line for many months owing to the disturbed state of the country.

V. ARGENTINA.

The year witnessed a further development of the political and commercial life of this prosperous republic. With the exception of the United States, no country in the Western Hemisphere enjoyed such happy conditions as did Argentina. During the year the statistics of the census taken in 1914 were published, and these showed that the republic contained a population of 7,885,237 persons, as compared with a population of under four millions in 1895, the year of the previous census. The proportion of foreigners dwelling in the country was, however, extraordinarily high. No fewer than 2,358,000 foreign subjects were living in Argentina in 1914, but this total had since been reduced by the European War, because many of the

foreign men (amongst whom Italians were especially numerous) had returned to Europe to fight for their respective countries. The large majority of the foreign residents were males, but the Argentine population proper showed that slight excess of females which is usual in nearly all countries.

During the earlier part of the year the attention of the country was fixed upon the presidential election and election of one moiety of the members of the Chamber, that is, sixty members. These elections were due in April. The Radical party was first in the field with its candidate for the Presidency, Dr. Hipolito Irigoyen being chosen. The Radicals selected Dr. Pelagio Luna as their candidate for the Vice-Presidency. The elections took place on April 2, and the polling was carried out without disturbances or rioting. The contest for the Presidency really lay between Dr. Irigoyen and Dr. de la Torre, the latter being the representative of the Democratic Progressives; but two other candidates were in the field, one of them being a Socialist. The system of election for the Argentine Presidency resembles that existing in the United States, that is, it is indirect, a college of 300 electors being chosen. The result is usually known, however, immediately after the popular election of the college, since the manner in which each member of the college will exercise his function is in practice usually known beforehand. On this occasion, however, the result remained uncertain for weeks, because nineteen electors belonged to the party of so-called Dissident Radicals, and these nineteen electors held the balance between the larger parties. It was not certain that they would vote for the candidate of the Radicals proper, Dr. Irigoyen. In the meantime, in the elections for the Chamber of Deputies, or rather, for one half of that Chamber, the Radicals had great successes, and secured thirty-five of the sixty vacant seats. The Socialists won only three seats, but it is notable that all three of these were for the city of Buenos Ayres. The voting in the College of Electors took place on June 12, and in the result a sufficient number of the Dissident Radicals voted for Dr. Irigoyen and Dr. Luna to ensure the election of those statesmen. These two candidates secured 152 votes, an absolute majority of the entire college, and were thus duly elected. The majority was made up of 145 Radicals and 7 Dissident Radicals. The group of Dissident Radicals belonged to the province of Santa Fe. According to the laws of the republic the new President and the new Vice-President would not be installed in their respective offices until October 12.

The outgoing President, Dr. de la Plaza, opened Congress on May 30, and delivered his last message to the legislature. He stated that although the republic had been suffering many injuries from the European War, it could face the unparalleled state of affairs with equanimity. The internal situation in Argentina was highly satisfactory, and resting on the foundation of a respect for law and for individual liberty, the commonwealth

continued to develop. In foreign relations, both the Government and the nation had preserved strict neutrality in the war. The President then referred to the recent elections, and said that he had preserved strict impartiality in these contests, and had exercised no influence in the political battle. He informed Congress that of the 1,189,282 voters whose names were on the register, only 745,825 had gone to the polls. Speaking of the recent action of the Chilean Ministry in proclaiming jurisdiction over the Straits of Magellan and the Islets Canal, he said that his Government had made representations to Chile on this question, and that it was gratifying to be able to record that the Chilean Government had agreed to refer the matter to the arbitration of the King of Great Britain. The remainder of the message dealt at great length with financial and commercial matters. The republic, said the President, had been less seriously affected by the war than had been anticipated, and the excellent harvest and the high prices to be obtained for all agricultural produce had done much to counteract the adverse influence of the European conflict.

On July 9 an anarchist named Juan Mandrini made an attempt to assassinate the President which was happily unsuccessful.

In October the new President and Vice-President were duly installed in office.

The Budget for 1917 showed an expenditure of 31,200,000%. and a revenue of 31,508,000%.

VI. BRAZIL.

Brazil passed through a year of quiet development and prosperity. In spite of some annoyance caused by the British commercial "Black Lists," the sympathies of the people in the war were almost wholly on the side of the Entente. In September the Foreign Minister, Dr. Lauro Muller, visited the United States and Canada with a view to establishing closer relations, commercial and otherwise, with those countries. After his return, the Minister made a speech at Pernambuco in which he stated that the object of Brazilian foreign policy was to promote an accord between all the nations of the Western Hemisphere and to prevent the discords of Europe spreading across the Atlantic.

Relations with Japan were very friendly, and arrangements were concluded to allow the immigration of 5,000 Japanese agricultural labourers yearly. The Budget for 1916 showed an estimated expenditure and revenue of 30,850,000%.

VII. CHILE.

There was little news of this republic during the year. President Sanfuentes remained in power throughout the year, but there were constant changes in the Cabinet. The President

opened Congress on June 1, and in his Message to the legislature he described the economic state of the country as highly satisfactory. The Budget for 1916 showed an expenditure of 11,186,828*l.* and a revenue of 10,412,072*l.* The Cabinet in power at the end of the year included Sr. Enrique Zanartu, Sr. Alamiro Huidobro (Foreign Secretary), and Sr. Arturo P. Carvajal (Finance Minister).

VIII. URUGUAY.

Political conditions in this republic were very disturbed during the year. One section of the politicians, including the President, Dr. Viera, and the ex-President Batlle, favoured a great reform in the constitution and the institution of a collegiate form of government. Elections were held, however, on July 30, and a majority of the candidates returned were opposed to this change. The President accepted the verdict of the country, but Sr. Batlle continued to agitate for the reform, and this led to constant changes in the Cabinet. The Budget for 1916-17 showed a revenue of 6,266,495*l.*, and an expenditure of 6,281,205*l.*

IX. PARAGUAY.

This republic was prosperous during the year, and a convention was concluded with Argentina establishing Free Trade between the two countries.

CHAPTER IX.

AUSTRALASIA.

I. AUSTRALIA.

OF all the changes produced in the world by the great war, the effects upon the political life of the Overseas Dominions of the British Crown, if not the most important, were by no means the least interesting. Before the war, Imperial affairs were almost exclusively the concern of the British electors, and in foreign policy the British Empire meant the London Government. The peoples of Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand were content to live their own lives and to develop their respective polities in the security given them by the British Navy, without troubling themselves greatly with the doings of the external world. To all seeming, though not in actual fact, they were more isolated from the perilous web of the politics which were to make the history of the Twentieth Century than was the American nation itself. The Dominions had complete control over their own affairs, and their local politics were full of life, but in that they had no foreign policy and no place among the nations, they had not reached nationhood. They were small anomalous communities which lacked even that voice in the world-drama which the minor nations of Europe possessed.

In these respects the war brought about sudden and revolutionary changes. Thousands of Australian and Canadian families were losing their men in a quarrel for which the Australian and Canadian Governments were not even in the most indirect manner responsible, and thus the conflagration stirred the thoughts of the new communities. Indifference to Imperial policy and foreign policy was no longer possible. Australians began to consider and to adopt theories about the position of Australia within the Empire, and about the foreign policy of the British Empire as a whole. This awakening to a wider political life was perhaps more noticeable in Australia than in any of the other three Dominions, and this fact must be attributed in the main to the extremely prominent part in Imperial politics which the new Australian Prime Minister, Mr. W. M. Hughes, began to play almost immediately after his appointment to that position.

And the natural result of the emergence of the Dominions into Imperial life was that in all of them, and markedly in Australia, new groupings of politicians, groupings based upon the opinions held in regard to the new Imperial issues, arose. And the new political divisions naturally tended, especially in Australia, to cut across the old party divisions, which had reference to Dominion politics, that is, to national as distinct from Imperial issues. Thus the most dramatic and the most important events in Australian politics during this year were caused by the emergence of these Imperial questions, and since the Prime Minister put himself at the head of a great movement in favour of an extreme form of Imperialism, Australia became the storm-centre of Imperial politics, the arena whereon a momentous contest was fought between two incompatible theories of Britannic partnership. The same problems were exercising men's minds in the British Isles and in the other Dominions, but nowhere else was there such a definite trial of strength between the two parties.

Early in the year the Prime Minister paid a prolonged visit to England, and there made himself famous by the speeches in which he advocated a vigorous Imperialist policy. He was one of the British representatives at the Economic Conference of the Allies which was held in Paris in June, and when he returned to Australia, via South Africa, a few weeks later, he made it known that he was prepared to advocate an extreme policy in foreign and Imperial affairs, involving (1) waging the war "to a finish" (that is, until the Central Powers were forced to surrender unconditionally); (2) compulsory military service in Australia, not merely, as hitherto, for home defence only, but for Imperial and foreign service; (3) Imperial trade protection, including especially a very high, or even prohibitive, tariff against German goods; and (4) a closer Imperial partnership between Great Britain and Australia and the other Dominions.

Events did not develop smoothly, however, for the Prime Minister. Even before he left Australia for England there were

signs of serious discord amongst those who were supposed to be the Premier's followers, that is, the Labour Party. A speech delivered by Mr. Hughes in the Sidney Town Hall on January 17 was notable as containing a violent attack, not upon the Liberals, but upon the Left Wing of the Labour Party, whom he denounced as "anarchists." Many of the Labour newspapers were furious at the language used on this occasion, and Mr. Hughes' speeches in England were criticised by the Australian Socialists with much severity, and often, unfortunately, with that abusive vulgarity which was all too common in Australian politics.

It was on the question of compulsory military (overseas) service that the schism in the Labour Party ultimately developed. In spite of vigorous propaganda, the enlistments under the voluntary system had not been so numerous as enthusiastic Imperialists desired. Before leaving for England, Mr. Hughes stated that he had promised the Imperial Government, and expected to be able to supply, 300,000 Australian troops by June, 1916. Whilst the Premier was away, Senator Pearce, who was Minister of Defence and Acting Prime Minister, announced that the British authorities expected only 209,500 by that date, but apparently he spoke under a misapprehension of the British Government's wishes. However, the number of soldiers sent out of Australia by the end of June did not in fact reach Senator Pearce's lower total, although it should not be forgotten that there were, in addition, over 60,000 men undergoing training in the Commonwealth. During June, July, and August the average monthly number of enlistments sank to 6,000. Thus the total number of volunteers obtained up to the end of August was about 280,000—a very high percentage for a Colony situated far from the seat of war, but not equal to the Premier's expectations.

Finding the position, judged by his standards, unsatisfactory, Mr. Hughes set to work to induce his colleagues in the Cabinet to acquiesce in a plan for imposing conscription upon the country, and the scheme adopted was propounded in both Houses of Parliament on August 31 and September 1. Even if it could have been regarded as permissible to carry through such a revolutionary change without consulting the electorate, it would not have been practicable to have proceeded directly to introduce in Parliament a Bill authorising conscription, since such a Bill would have been foredoomed to rejection on the part of the Senate. The Upper House was completely dominated by the Labour Party, which had already declared against conscription by large majorities. The scheme which Mr. Hughes explained was therefore the truly democratic procedure of asking the consent of the people in a referendum. This plebiscite was to be held at the end of October. In the meantime a formal appeal was to be sent forth for 32,500 volunteers in September. If that number were not obtained, the Government would exercise their powers and call up for training all single men

between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five. Then, if the Government's proposal were approved by the majority of the voters, the men called up would be utilised for foreign service as required.

It was necessary to pass a Bill authorising the referendum, but this Bill met with no very serious opposition. The question which the Government were thus authorised to put to the electors was very simply worded, and read as follows: "Are you in favour of the Government having in this grave emergency the same compulsory powers over citizens in regard to requiring their military service for the term of the war outside the Commonwealth as now apply to military service within the Commonwealth."

The political campaign which ensued was of a most violent character. The great majority of the Labour Party were bitterly hostile to the proposal. The Labour League of New South Wales expelled Mr. Hughes from its membership, though the New South Wales Premier, Mr. Holman, who was also a Labourite, supported the proposal for conscription. The Australian Workers' Union declared against compulsory service. Mr. Tudor, Minister of Trade, resigned from the Federal Cabinet. The number of recruits obtained during September fell short of the specified 32,500, and hence the Government issued a proclamation calling up single men in accordance with the scheme described above, but in the proclamation the upper age-limit was thirty-five, not forty-five. By the terms of the proclamation Members of Parliament, judges, clergy, medical men, and conscientious objectors were exempted from service. Mr. Cook, the leader of the Liberal Party, and the great majority of the Opposition supported the Premier's proposals.

The referendum was fixed for October 28. On October 27 Mr. Higgs, Mr. Gardiner, and Mr. Russell suddenly resigned from the Government. Intense excitement prevailed throughout the country, but little surprise was felt when the first figures indicated that conscription had probably been rejected. Australian soldiers on active service were entitled to vote, and, owing to this, and to the delay in collecting the results from outlying regions such as Papua, the final result of the plebiscite was not known for more than three weeks, and even then was not quite exact. The figures published were:—

Against	-	-	-	-	-	1,146,000
For	-	-	-	-	-	1,085,000
Majority against	-	-	-	-	-	<u>61,000</u>

The result of the referendum, combined with the resignation of some of the Cabinet Ministers, was a severe blow for Mr. Hughes. The suggestion was made that a coalition between Mr. Hughes' followers and the Liberals should be effected. The anti-conscriptionists possessed a majority in the Senate, but in the House of Representatives the Liberals and the

Hughesites could, by combining, have commanded the situation. The Prime Minister preferred, however, to reconstruct his Ministry entirely from his own followers. The new Cabinet thus formed included Mr. Pearce (Defence), Mr. Jensen (Marine), Mr. Webster (Postmaster-General), Mr. Poynton (Treasurer), Mr. Archibald (Trade), Mr. Bamford (Home Affairs), Mr. Lynch (Works), Mr. Spence (Vice-President of Executive Council), and Mr. Russell and Mr. Laird Smith.

In New South Wales the other course was taken, Mr. Holman combining with Mr. Wade, the Liberal Leader, to form a Coalition Ministry. A Bill was passed prolonging the life of the State Parliament for one year.

There was much industrial unrest in the country during the year, and in November a general strike of the coal-miners occurred, which caused a serious dislocation of business throughout the Commonwealth.

The Federal Budget for 1915-16 showed receipts (including loans) amounting to 89,092,000*l.*, and an expenditure (including war expenditure) of 76,057,000*l.* A Second Australian War Loan was issued in August, and over 23,000,000*l.* was subscribed.

At the end of the year it was announced that the majority of the Australian soldiers on active service had voted in favour of the conscription proposals.

II. NEW ZEALAND.

The Dominion of New Zealand had throughout its short history held to a very vigorous type of Imperialism, and the beginning of 1916 found the country, under the inspiring leadership of its Coalition Government, marshalling its manhood in order to help in the mother country's war. New Zealand possessed a relatively large number of potential soldiers, because the proportion of males to females in the country was, as in most young countries, high, and also because (owing to the constant process of colonisation) the average age was low—old people were few. The registration of men which was taken at the end of 1915, and which asked of all men between the ages of nineteen and forty-five whether they were prepared to volunteer for the Expeditionary Force, had not produced results which the Government could regard as very satisfactory. About 110,000 men had, indeed, expressed their willingness to serve (see A.R., 1915, p. 360), but the mere statement had no binding force, and at the beginning of 1916 it was found that men were coming forward more slowly than was desired. The 110,000 prospective volunteers were classified according to their marital condition, as follows:—

Single men and widowers without dependents	-	-	-	-	33,127
Single men and widowers with dependents	-	-	-	-	17,268
Married men	-	-	-	-	60,288

This was regarded by some as creditable, but there was a reverse side to the picture. Thus the census showed that the men

who refused to volunteer were also numerous. These were classified as follows:—

Not prepared to volunteer for the army, but willing to serve in a civil capacity	43,524
Previously volunteered, but rejected	9,042
Incapacitated for military service	8,968
Refused either to volunteer for the army or to serve in a civil capacity	34,886

Of those who refused to serve in any manner, fewer than 9,000 were single men or widowers without dependents. It will be seen that New Zealand possessed 200,000 men of military age, and to these must be added the 25,000 men who had already volunteered before the end of 1915. The aim of the Prime Minister, Mr. Massey, was to obtain 2,500 recruits per month during 1916, that is, 30,000 during the year, and during the earlier part of the year tremendous efforts were made by the recruiting boards to beat up the men, at first with some success.

After some months had passed, however, it was realised that the required rate of reinforcement could not be maintained without resort to compulsion. Public opinion in the Dominion was ripe for this change. A Bill establishing an "Expeditionary Force Reserve" was therefore introduced in Parliament in June. The new Reserve was to consist of two divisions, the first comprising unmarried men, men married after May 1, 1915, widowers without children, and divorced husbands without children, and the second division including all other men. The age-limits were twenty and forty-six. The two divisions of the Reserve might be enrolled by proclamation, and the number of men required would then be selected by lot. It will be seen that the division of the Reserve into an unmarried and a married category followed the British example in these matters. In the Lower House the only opposition to the Bill came from the Labour Party; five of the six Socialists voted against the measure. The Bill became law, however, in August, and in September both divisions of the new Reserve were "enrolled," but the fact of enrolment did not imply that the men were actually called up.

The first effect of the passing of the Bill was to stimulate "voluntary" recruitment, but in November the number again fell short of the requirements, and the first ballot was therefore duly held. The Act provided facilities for men to appeal against being called up (1) on grounds of special hardship; (2) because on national grounds they were required in civil employment; and (3) as religious conscientious objectors.

In the domestic politics of this Dominion no noteworthy events occurred, the people being absorbed in the war. An Act was passed prolonging the life of Parliament from December, 1917, to December, 1918, in order to avoid a general election during the war.

The finances of the Dominion were necessarily abnormal owing to the war expenditure. A War Loan was issued in August, over 10,000,000*l.* being subscribed.

PART II.
CHRONICLE OF EVENTS
IN 1916.

JANUARY.

1. The New Year Honours included mainly war distinctions. The Tsar of Russia was made a Field-Marshal; Lord Curzon and the Duke of Devonshire became Knights of the Garter and Lord Mersey was created a Viscount. There were six new Peers, comprising Lord Charles Beresford, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Sir A. Henderson, Sir D. T. Shaughnessy, Mr. W. W. Astor and Captain Cecil Norton; Mr. Will Crooks and Mr. G. N. Barnes became Privy Councillors. The new Baronets included Vice-Admiral Sir Doveton Sturdee and Mr. W. E. Goschen. The Order of Merit was conferred on Mr. Henry James; and among the new Knights was Dr. Lazarus Fletcher, F.R.S., Director of the Natural History Museum.

— A gale swept over England and Wales causing much damage.

— A British force under Colonel Gorges occupied Yaunde in Cameroon.

2. The Glen Line passenger steamer *Glengyle* was sunk in the Mediterranean with a loss of about ten lives.

3. The price of bread was increased to 9d. for the 4 lb. loaf.

4. Announcement that the P. & O. liner *Geelong* had been sunk in the Mediterranean.

5. The Prime Minister introduced the Military Service Bill in the House of Commons.

6. The British submarine E 17 sank off the island of Texel; her crew of thirty-three being rescued and interned by the Dutch.

8. The average price of home-grown wheat during this week was 55s. 8d. a quarter as compared with 46s. 2d. in 1915, and 30s. 11d. in 1914.

9. Announcement of the complete evacuation of the Gallipoli Peninsula.

— The total British casualties in all fields of operations now amounted to 549,467.

10. Announcement that H.M.S. *King Edward VII.* had struck a mine and sunk without loss of life.

— The Post Offices of the United Kingdom opened for subscriptions to Exchequer Bonds of 5*l.*, 20*l.* and 50*l.* denomination, at 5 per cent. interest.

— Mr. J. D. Gilbert (L.) was elected member for West Newington by a majority of 1,859 over the Independent candidate.

— The rate of discount on books not published net was reduced from 25 per cent. to 16½ per cent.

— Temporary Major-General R. H. K. Butler was gazetted as Deputy Chief of the General Staff, in succession to Temporary Major-General R. P. Whigham, C.B., D.S.O.

11. *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. Herbert Samuel as Home Secretary in succession to Sir John Simon.

— Sir George Reid was returned unopposed as member for St. George's, Hanover Square.

— *The Times* announced that Professor W. H. Perkin, F.R.S., had accepted the post of head of the Research Department of British Dyes (Limited).

12. *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. E. S. Montagu as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in succession to Mr. Herbert Samuel.

— The second reading of the Military Service Bill passed through the House of Commons by 431 votes to 39.

— Rise in coal freights. 85*s.* per ton was paid for shipment from Newcastle to Genoa.

13. Capture of Cettigne by the Austrians.

— The French submarine *Foucault* torpedoed and sank an Austrian scout of the Novara type in the Lower Adriatic.

— The late Sir Andrew Noble, Bart., left estate of the gross value of 734,418*l.*

14. Lord Chelmsford, G.C.M.G., was appointed Viceroy of India in succession to Lord Hardinge, due to retire at the end of March.

15. The Norwegian town of Bergen was devastated by fire.

— T. Tribich Lincoln, the alleged spy and ex-M.P. for Darlington, escaped from custody in Brooklyn.

16. A "stop-the-war demonstration" was broken up in North London.

17. The Prince of Wales addressed the Statutory Committee of the Royal Pensions Fund Corporation, constituted by the Naval and Military War Pensions Act of 1915. It was announced that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had undertaken to ask Parliament for a grant of 1,000,000*l.* to the funds of the Committee.

19. *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. J. A. Pease as Postmaster-General in succession to Mr. Samuel.

20. The French Prime Minister travelled from London to Paris, after

attending conferences of the Allied Council of War at No. 10 Downing Street.

21. Lieut.-Commander E. C. Cookson, D.S.O., R.N., was granted the V.C. for gallantry on the Tigris.

— A combine was agreed upon between the District, City and South London, London Electric, and Central London Railway Companies, and the London General Omnibus Company.

22. It was announced that the British Museum and all other public museums and galleries would shortly be closed, in the interests of economy.

23. Hostile aeroplanes early in the morning dropped nine bombs on the east coast of Kent, but did no military damage.

— Skutari was occupied by Austro-Hungarian troops.

24. A German sea-plane passed over Dover.

25. Mr. Warwick Brookes (U., Coalition) was elected member for the Mile-end division of the Tower Hamlets by a majority of 376 over Mr. Pemberton Billing, who had fought the constituency in the name of the Air Defence of London.

— *The Times* announced that the King had approved the appointment of Mr. H. W. T. Bowyear to be a Charity Commissioner in succession to the late Mr. A. F. Leach.

27. Parliament was prorogued to February 15.

— The Marquis of Granby was married to Miss Kathleen Tennant.

29. A Zeppelin flew over Paris, dropping bombs which killed and wounded over fifty persons.

30. Mr. Andrew Fisher, late Prime Minister of the Australian Commonwealth, arrived in London to take up the post of High Commissioner for Australia.

31. Zeppelin raid over the Eastern, North-Eastern, and Midland Counties, including Norfolk, Suffolk, Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Staffordshire and Derbyshire, caused fifty-nine deaths and 101 cases of injury.

— The price of the 4 lb. loaf of bread in London rose to 9½d.

FEBRUARY.

1. The British steamship *Appam* arrived at the American port of Norfolk, Virginia, with a German prize crew on board.

— The Turkish Heir-Apparent, Prince Yussuf Izz-ed-Din, committed suicide [*v. Obit.*].

— The use of the chimes and striking of the public clocks in London was discontinued between sunset and sunrise.

2. Discovery by a steam trawler of the Zeppelin L 19 wrecked in the North Sea.

3. Royal Proclamation fixed the date of the commencement of the Military Service Act for February 10,

3. The Parliament Buildings at Ottawa were destroyed by fire.

— Partial Eclipse of the Sun was scarcely visible in London owing to the clouds.

4. The King directed that the Earl of Donoughmore and Viscount Powerscourt be appointed Knights of the Order of St. Patrick.

5. A new order of the Central Control Board restricted the sale and supply of liquor in the Lancashire and Cheshire area.

— Dr. Vincent Henry Stanton was elected Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, vacant by the resignation of Dr. Swete.

— *The Times* announced that Lord Curzon of Kedleston and General Sir Douglas Haig had been deputed to proceed on a special mission to the King of the Belgians.

— *The Times* also announced that Mr. Alfred Bigland, M.P. for Birkenhead, had been appointed to the Assistant Directorship of Munitions in the War Propellant Department.

7. New restrictions on the supply of petrol.

— A fire broke out on H.M. boarding steamer *Peel Castle* in the Straits of Dover.

— M. Ribot, the French Minister of Finance, had a conference with the Chancellor of the Exchequer at the Treasury.

8. The Berlin evening papers stated that the number of prisoners of war in Germany was 1,429,971.

9. Appointment of the "National Organising Committee for War Savings" under the chairmanship of the Right Hon. G. N. Barnes, M.P.

— German sea-planes dropped bombs at Ramsgate and Broadstairs, injuring two women and a child.

10. Announcement that General J. C. Smuts had been appointed to the command of the British troops in East Africa, Sir Horace Smith-Dorrien having resigned through ill-health.

— Single men aged from 19 to 30 were called up by Proclamation under the Military Service Act, from March 2nd.

— A deputation waited on the Prime Minister to protest against the closing of Museums and Art Galleries; but only obtained minor concessions.

11. Resignation of Mr. Garrison, the American Secretary of War, and of his assistant, Mr. Henry Breckinridge.

— *The Times* announced that the Committee of the Privy Council for Scientific and Industrial Research had appointed the Hon. Sir Charles A. Parsons, K.C.B., F.R.S., to be a member of their Advisory Council.

— The Newspaper Proprietors' Association gave a banquet in honour of the French provincial journalists who had come over to visit the fleet and munition areas.

12. General Smuts left Durban for East Africa.

14. Royal Proclamations were posted calling up for military service the remaining groups and classes of single men, beginning from March 18.

— Under an Order in Council of January 27, registration became imperative for all aliens except in the Metropolitan Police District.

15. The Admiralty announced that H.M.S. *Arethusa* had struck a mine off the East coast, and sunk with a loss of about ten lives.

— Opening of Parliament.

— A Proclamation was issued prohibiting the importation of paper-making materials, paper, tobacco, furniture woods, and stones and slates into the United Kingdom.

— Announcement that Captains William R. Hall, C.B., and Allan F. Everett, C.B., had been appointed Naval Aides-de-Camp to the King.

— Great gale in London and other parts of the country.

16. Capture of Erzerum by the Russians.

— A Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas Whittaker, M.P., to grant licences for the importation of paper, wood-pulp, etc., and to arrange for its distribution on equitable terms.

— *The Times* announced that Lord Murray of Elibank had resigned his position of honorary Director-General of Munitions Recruiting, owing to ill-health.

17. The War Office announced that the conquest of Cameroon was almost complete.

— The Upper House of Convocation carried a resolution with only one dissentient, condemning the policy of reprisals for outrages committed by the enemy.

18. Appeal by the National Organising Committee for War Savings, against the use of motor cars and motor cycles for pleasure.

— J. M. M. Dallas, a clerk in the Home Office, was sentenced to three years' penal servitude for accepting bribes.

19. Mr. Hughes, Prime Minister of Australia, was sworn of the Canadian Privy Council and took part in a Cabinet meeting at Ottawa.

— T. Tribirch Lincoln, the ex-M.P., was recaptured in New York [v. Jan. 15].

20. German sea-planes raided Lowestoft and Walmer, killing one boy and injuring another.

21. First day of the battle of Verdun.

— The Zeppelin L 77 was destroyed by a French incendiary shell near Révigny, the crew of between twenty and thirty being burnt to death.

— The members of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce voted by 988 to 527 in favour of referring back to the directors their memorandum in favour of Free Trade after the war.

21. The British members of the Inter-Parliamentary Committee, headed by Lord Bryce, were received by M. Briand at the French Foreign Office.

— M. Sembat, French Minister of Public Works; M. Painlevé, Minister of Public Instruction and of Inventions; M. Nail, Under-Secretary of State for the Mercantile Marine; M. Paul Bignon, Deputy for Dieppe, and other French military and civil officials, arrived in London for the purpose of exchanging views with the British Government.

22. *The Times* announced that Lieut.-General Sir Henry Sclater, K.C.B., had been appointed General Officer Commanding-in-Chief the Southern Command, in succession to Lieut.-General Sir W. P. Campbell, K.C.B., who took over the command at Chester from General Sir H. Mackinnon, appointed Director of Recruiting.

— The King conferred the G.C.B. on Sir Henry Sclater, who was succeeded by Lieut.-General Sir Nevil Macready, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., as Adjutant-General to the Forces.

— Opening of the Duma by the Tsar.

— Mr. Harding, District Judge of Trichinopoly, was fatally stabbed while going to the Court.

23. The German steamers in the Tagus were seized by the Portuguese.

— Snowstorms occurred throughout most of the country.

24. The Archbishop of Canterbury consecrated the Rev. H. E. Bilbrough as Bishop-Suffragan of Dover.

— *The Times* announced that Ministers had decided for the future to accept one-quarter of their salaries in the form of 5 per cent. Exchequer Bonds.

25. The Newspaper Proprietors' Association entertained to dinner Russian writers and journalists on a visit to England.

— Announcement that a committee under the chairmanship of Lord Newton had been appointed to advise the Board of Trade as to the granting of licences for the importation of tobacco.

26. The French transport *Provence II.* was sunk in the Central Mediterranean with a loss of over 900 lives.

27. The P. & O. steamer *Maloja*, the largest of the P. & O. Company's fleet, was struck by a mine between Dover and Folkestone, and sunk in half an hour, with a loss of 155 lives, including forty-nine passengers.

28. *The Times* announced that Canon St.-J. B. Wynne Willson, Master of Marlborough College, had been appointed Dean of Bristol.

— Lord de Freyne was married to Miss Victoria Arnott.

29. An engagement took place in the North Sea between an armed German "raider," disguised as a Norwegian merchant vessel, and the British armed merchant cruiser *Alcantara*, as a result of which both vessels were sunk.

— The blockade of the coast of the German Cameroon was raised at midnight.

MARCH.

1. A German sea-plane dropped bombs over the South-East coast, killing a child, but causing no military damage. It subsequently descended in the sea, and was picked up by the French.

— H.M.S. *Primula*, a minesweeper, was torpedoed and sunk in the Eastern Mediterranean, with a loss of three lives.

2. Capture of Bitlis by the Russians.

— The Military Service Act came into operation, establishing compulsion for single men.

— Resignation of his seat in Parliament by Mr. Francis Neilson, Liberal M.P. for Hyde, owing to his opposition to the war.

3. Announcement that Lord Newton had taken charge of "certain departments of the Foreign Office," over which Lord Robert Cecil had hitherto presided.

— *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. H. W. T. Bowyear to be Chief Commissioner to the Charity Commission, in succession to Sir Charles Cook, K.C.B.; and of Mr. H. P. Morris to be Second Commissioner and Secretary.

4. An explosion at the fort of St. Denis near Paris caused over 100 casualties.

— Announcement that Mr. Bridgeman, M.P., was acting as Assistant-Director of the War Trade Department at the Foreign Office.

— The V.C. was granted to Second Lieut. A. V. Smith, who was killed by the explosion of a grenade, upon which he had thrown himself to protect others from injury.

— A Proclamation was posted calling to the colours married men from 25 to 32, who had attested under the Derby Scheme.

5. A Zeppelin raid took place over the counties of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Rutland, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, Essex, and Kent. There were seventy casualties, but little material damage.

— The Spanish steamer *Principe de Asturias* struck a rock near Ponta Boi, Sao Sebastiao, and sank with a loss of nearly 400 lives.

6. Lord Crewe took charge of the Foreign Office during a few days' absence of Sir Edward Grey.

7. Mr. Hughes, Prime Minister of the Australian Commonwealth, arrived in England.

— Heavy snowfall throughout the country.

9. British troops in East Africa occupied Chala and Taveta.

— Rupture of relations and declaration of war between Germany and Portugal.

— The King and Queen visited the Star and Garter Hospital for disabled soldiers at Richmond.

10. Major-General S. S. Long, C.B., resigned his post as Director of Supplies and Transport, owing to differences of opinion on a question of administration.

10. Mr. Pemberton Billing was elected by a majority of 1,031 for the East Herts Division, in the interests of "a strong air policy."

— The King appointed Mr. Hughes a Privy Councillor.

— The Lighting Orders in London were increased in stringency.

11. The Admiralty announced that H.M. torpedo-boat destroyer *Coquette*, and H.M. torpedo-boat No. 11, had struck mines off the East coast and sunk, with a loss of forty-five men.

13. The Admiralty announced that the Fleet Auxiliary *Fauvette* had struck a mine off the East coast, and sunk with a loss of two officers and twelve men.

— The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal against the judgment in favour of Charles Slingsby, an infant, who claimed to be tenant in tail male in remainder of the Slingsby estates in Yorkshire. The Court found that the boy was not a legitimate son.

14. Major-General C. E. Heath, C.V.O., C.B., was appointed to the new post of Deputy Quartermaster-General.

— Brevet-Colonel A. R. C. Atkins, C.M.G., was appointed Director of Supplies and Transport.

15. Resignation of Admiral von Tirpitz on the alleged ground of ill-health.

16. The Dutch liner *Tubantia*, of nearly 14,000 tons, was torpedoed and sunk off the Dutch coast.

17. The *Standard* newspaper suspended publication.

18. Recognition was granted to the National Reservists by the formation of "The Royal Defence Corps."

19. Four German sea-planes dropped bombs over East Kent, killing eleven persons and injuring thirty-one.

— The Russians captured Ispahan.

20. Sixty-five allied aeroplanes bombarded Zeebrugge.

— Announcement that the Prince of Wales had arrived in Egypt on appointment as Staff-Captain on the Staff of the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force.

— *The Times* announced that Sir Marshall Frederick Reid, C.I.E., had been appointed a member of the Council of India, in succession to Sir Felix Schuster.

21. Announcement that Surgeon-General W. Babbie, V.C., had been appointed to assist Surgeon-General Sir A. Keogh, Director-General, Army Medical Services.

— In a libel action brought by Mrs. Asquith against the owners of the *Globe* newspaper, which had alleged that she sent food and other things to German officers who were prisoners of war, the *Globe* unreservedly withdrew the allegations, and agreed to pay damages of 1,000*l.* and indemnify Mrs. Asquith for all expenses to which she had been put in connexion with the matter.

22. General Count Luigi Cadorna, Commander-in-Chief of the Italian Armies, arrived in London from Paris.

23. The Atlantic Transport Company's liner *Minneapolis* was torpedoed and sunk in the Mediterranean, with a loss of about eighteen lives.

— *The Times* announced that the Galloper lightship had been torpedoed and sunk.

— General Cadorna lunched with the Prime Minister, and was afterwards received by the King.

24. The London, Brighton, and South Coast steamer *Sussex* was torpedoed off Dieppe, with a loss of about fifty lives.

— In the Market Harborough Division of Leicestershire, Mr. P. A. Harris, the Coalition candidate, was returned by a majority of 4,115 over Mr. Gibson Bowles.

— The military raided the offices of the Gaelic Press in Dublin.

— The War Office announced that General Sir A. Murray, K.C.B., had assumed sole command of the forces in Egypt; and that General Sir J. G. Maxwell, K.C.B., was returning to England.

25. British sea-planes attacked German air-ship sheds in Schleswig-Holstein. Two German armed patrol vessels were sunk by destroyers. Later in the day a German destroyer was rammed and sunk by H.M.S. *Cleopatra*.

— *The Times* announced that Generals Sir Arthur Paget and Sir Bruce Hamilton had been selected for important Home Commands under Lord French.

27. A conference opened in Paris between Ministers representative of Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia, Belgium, Serbia, Portugal, and Japan, to discuss military and economic problems.

— *The Times* announced that Sir Henry Angst would retire at the end of the month from the post of His Majesty's Honorary Consul-General for Switzerland.

— One of the worst snowstorms for many years swept over the country, disorganising the railways and the telegraph and telephone services.

28. A cutter belonging to H.M.S. *Conquest* was caught in a blizzard and lost, with forty men.

29. General Shuvaieff was appointed Russian Minister of War in place of General Polivanoff.

30. In the Hyde by-election, Mr. T. Owen Jacobsen, the Coalition candidate, was returned by a majority of 874 over Mr. P. Davies.

— The V.C. was awarded to six officers and men of the British Army.

31. The Crown Prince of Serbia arrived in London.

— Five Zeppelins raided the Eastern counties, killing forty-three and injuring sixty-six persons. One of the Zeppelins was brought down by gunfire, and the crew surrendered.

— The V.C. was granted to Sub-Lieut. A. W. S. Tisdall, who had been killed in action on May 6, 1916.

— The King presented to the Treasury the sum of 100,000*l*.

APRIL.

1. Zeppelin raid on the North-East coast, in which sixteen persons were killed, and about 100 injured.

2. Zeppelin raid on the Scottish coast, in which about ten persons were killed, and eleven injured.

— One hundred and six men were killed and sixty-six injured as the result of a fire and explosion in a powder factory in Kent.

4. A Zeppelin crossed the East Anglian coast, but without causing any casualties or damage.

— *The Times* announced that Dr. E. Lyttelton had resigned the headmastership of Eton College from Christmas next.

5. Three Zeppelins raided the North-East coast; one person was killed and eight injured.

7. Announcement that the P. & O. liner *Simla* had been torpedoed and sunk in the Mediterranean.

— The first eight groups of attested married men reported for service.

— *The Times* announced the marriage, about a month previously, between Lord Russell and the Countess von Arnim.

9. The crowd broke up a meeting in Trafalgar Square, organised by the Women's Suffrage Federation, for demanding votes for women, and to protest against the restrictions imposed under the Defence of the Realm Act, the Munitions Act, and the Military Service Act.

10. The King conferred a Barony of the United Kingdom on the Rt. Hon. Henry Chaplin, M.P.; and upon Mr. Justice Boyd on his resignation from the High Court of Ireland.

— The Rt. Hon. John Gordon, K.C., M.P., was appointed in succession to Mr. Justice Boyd; and the Rt. Hon. James Campbell, K.C., M.P., to be Attorney-General for Ireland in place of Mr. Gordon.

— Lord Derby and Lord Montagu of Beaulieu resigned their seats on the Joint Air Committee.

11. It was stated in New York that Mr. J. Pierpoint Morgan had sold for 200,000*l.* the forty tapestries placed by his father in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

12. Execution of a prisoner found guilty of espionage by a General Court-Martial.

— A deputation of thirty-two members of the National Union of Attested Married Men was received by Mr. Asquith, who undertook to see what could be done to release those who had been improperly induced to enlist.

13. Three British steamers, a British barque, and a Russian barquentine were reported to have been torpedoed.

14. Naval aeroplanes bombarded Constantinople and Adrianople.

— 70 per cent. was accepted by underwriters to cover the risk of peace not being declared by the end of the year; and 40 per cent. to cover the risk of peace not being declared by the end of June, 1917.

17. Capture of Trebizond by the Russians.

18. *The Times* reported that two British and two Norwegian vessels had been sunk by torpedo and gunfire.

— The third Earl of Cranbrook left unsettled estate of the gross value of 118,212*l*.

— The London County Council estimates for 1916-17 provided for a reduction of 3*d*. in the rates.

20. Mr. D. Y. Cameron, Mr. Maurice Greiffenhagen, and Mr. Bertram Priestman were elected Associates of the Royal Academy.

— *The Times* announced that the Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt, M.P., and Mr. H. F. Cook had been appointed trustees of the National Portrait Gallery.

— The King conferred the V.C. upon the Rev. E. M. Mellish, temporary Chaplain to the Forces, for conspicuous bravery in the trenches.

— Sir Stuart Coats, the Unionist candidate, was returned for the Wimbledon Division of Surrey by a majority of 1,811 over Mr. Kennedy Jones, who stood as an Independent.

— 25 per cent. was accepted to cover the risk of a total loss should peace be declared before the end of the year.

21. Sir Roger Casement landed in Ireland, and was taken prisoner.

22. Lord Hardinge of Penshurst arrived in England from India on the termination of his Viceroyalty.

— *The Times* announced the impending appointment of the Rev. Dr. A. W. Robinson to the residentiary Canonry of Canterbury.

23. Three hundredth anniversary of the deaths of Shakespeare and Cervantes.

— Major-General Dobell and Brigadier-General Cunliffe arrived at Plymouth on the completion of the Cameroon campaign.

24. Outbreak of rebellion in Dublin.

— Announcement that General Polivanoff, former Russian Minister for War, had been appointed to a command on the front in the Strypa sector.

— Opening of the 24th Annual Conference of the Independent Labour Party at Newcastle.

— Zeppelins raided Norfolk and Suffolk, dropping incendiary bombs.

25. The German battle-cruiser squadron attacked Lowestoft and Yarmouth, and hit two British light cruisers and a destroyer.

— Celebration in London of "Anzac Day," the anniversary of the landing of the Australian and New Zealand contingents in Gallipoli.

— Essex and Kent were raided by Zeppelins, 100 bombs being dropped over the Thames Estuary.

— H.M. submarine E 22 was sunk in the southern waters of the North Sea, two of the crew being rescued and taken prisoners.

26. Zeppelins over the East coast of Kent.

27. H.M.S. *Russell* struck a mine in the Mediterranean, and sank with a loss of about 124 men.

— A German submarine was sunk off the East coast, one officer and seventeen men being made prisoners.

— Proclamations were posted throughout the country calling up for military service married men from 27 to 35, who had enlisted under the Derby Scheme.

28. It was announced that the British S.S. *Industry* was sunk by a submarine, and the crew left in open boats in the Atlantic, 120 miles from the nearest land.

29. The War Office announced that General Townshend had surrendered with 2,970 British and about 6,000 Indian troops [v. History of the War].

— Announcement that the King had appointed Major-General C. M. Dobell, C.M.G., D.S.O., to the order of K.C.B., Military Division.

— The Scottish Trade Union Congress at Glasgow voted a motion of opposition to Compulsory Military Service by 66 to 46.

— Mr. A. L. Smith was elected Master of Balliol.

30. The principal shipping losses during April were estimated at 5,909,150*l*.

MAY.

1. End of the rising in Dublin.

— The Duke of Montrose, K.T., was appointed Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

2. Five hostile airships attacked the North-East coast of England and South-East coast of Scotland, injuring thirty-six persons.

— The King conferred a knighthood on Mr. F. R. Benson after witnessing a tercentenary celebration of *Julius Cæsar* at Drury Lane Theatre.

3. Lord Rayleigh presided at a meeting organised by Sir Ray Lankester to protest against the neglect of science in England.

— A hostile sea-plane dropped bombs on Deal, injuring two men and one woman.

— The Zeppelin L 20 was wrecked off Norway.

4. A Zeppelin was destroyed by British warships off the coast of Schleswig.

5. A Zeppelin was destroyed at Salonika by British ships.

6. The late Lord Clanricarde left estate of the gross value of 2,500,000*l*.

8. The White Star liner *Oymric* was torpedoed and sunk about 140 miles from the West coast of Ireland.

— Announcement that Sir Robert Chalmers, G.C.B., had been appointed Under-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

— *The Times* announced that the Bishop of Chichester had appointed Canon F. D. Pierce to be Vicar of Brighton.

9. Announcement that Brigadier-General A. C. Geddes had been appointed Director of Recruiting in place of General Sir W. H. MacKinnon, K.C.B., K.C.V.O.

13. Lieut.-General Sir J. Wolfe Murray, K.C.B., was appointed General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, First Class, vice Sir H. M. L. Rundle, G.C.B., resigned.

15. Sir Roger Casement was brought up at Bow Street Police Court on a charge of high treason.

16. The Dutch steamer *Batavier V.* was blown up and sunk between London and Rotterdam, with a loss of four of the crew.

17. Mr. W. F. Hicks Beach was returned for the Tewkesbury Division of Gloucestershire as a Conservative, supporting the Coalition Government, by a majority of 5,689 over the Independent candidate.

— Sir Roger Casement was committed for trial on a charge of high treason.

19. *The Times* announced the appointment of the Rev. G. K. S. Marshall as Vicar of Fulham.

— The Murillo "Holy Family and St. John" was sold at Christie's for 6,200 guineas to Mr. Amor.

19-20. German sea-planes raided the East coast of Kent, killing or wounding three persons.

21. The Summer Time Act came into operation at 2 A.M., the clocks throughout the country being advanced one hour.

22. The Curators of Edinburgh University appointed Sir James Alfred Ewing Principal in place of the late Sir William Turner.

23. *The Times* announced the appointment of the Rev. William Hartley Carnegie as Chaplain to the House of Commons.

24. Captain J. R. White, only son of the late Field-Marshal Sir George White, was sentenced to three months' imprisonment in the second division for offences under the Defence of the Realm Regulations. It was alleged that he had stimulated discontent among the Welsh miners.

25. A delegation of French Professors paid a visit to Oxford.

— The second Military Service Bill received the Royal Assent by Commission.

27. The rates of insurance providing for the payment of claims if peace should not be declared were as follows:—

By the end of the year—about 80 per cent.

By July 31, 1917—50 guineas per cent.

By Dec. 1, 1917—30 guineas per cent.

By Dec. 31, 1918—8 guineas per cent.

30. It was announced that Mr. Runciman had broken down under the strain of work; and that during his absence Mr. Harcourt would take charge of the Board of Trade.

31. Great naval battle off the coast of Jutland [*v.* History of the War].

— Mr. Asquith announced that the Whit-Monday Bank Holiday was to be postponed till Tuesday, August 8.

— Sir Ernest Shackleton arrived at the Falkland Islands from his southern exploring expedition.

JUNE.

1. Mr. Justice Astbury dismissed a motion in which a German-born member of the Stock Exchange sought to set aside the decision of the Committee in refusing his application for re-election.

— A delegation of French professors arrived at Cambridge for a visit of four days.

2. *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir William Scott Barrett as Constable of Lancaster Castle.

3. The King's Birthday Honours included five new Peers: Mr. George Coats; Mr. Colston, formerly M.P. for the Thornbury Division; Sir Savile Crossley; Mr. Tonman Mosley, Chairman of the Bucks County Council; and Sir Arthur Nicolson. Mr. Balfour received the Order of Merit. The Lord Chief Justice (Lord Reading) became a Viscount; and the other honours included seven Privy Councillorships, twelve Baronetcies, and thirty-one Knighthoods. Sir Cecil Spring Rice, British Ambassador at Washington, became a G.C.M.G.

— The Treasury announced the issue of War Expenditure Certificates, having a currency of two years, in amounts of 1,000*l.*, 5,000*l.*, and 10,000*l.*

— Summer Time came into operation at midnight throughout Italy.

5. H.M.S. *Hampshire* was sunk by a mine west of the Orkneys; Lord Kitchener and his staff being drowned.

— The delegation of French professors left Cambridge.

— The Hon. Bertrand Russell was fined 100*l.* with 10*l.* costs for making statements calculated to prejudice recruiting.

6. *The Times* announced the appointments of Mr. H. C. M. Lambert, C.B., and Mr. G. E. A. Grindle, C.M.G., as Assistant Under-Secretaries of State in the Colonial Office. Mr. H. C. M. Lambert was also appointed Secretary to the Imperial Conference in succession to Sir H. W. Just, K.C.M.G., C.B.

— The Dean and Chapter of Westminster appointed the Rev. Canon E. H. Pearce to be Archdeacon of Westminster, in place of the late Dr. A. B. O. Wilberforce.

7. The Admiralty announced the appointments of Vice-Admiral Sir Frederick T. Hamilton, K.C.B., C.V.O., as Commander-in-Chief at Rosyth, in succession to Admiral Sir Robert Lowry; and of Acting Vice-Admiral the Hon. Sir Somerset Arthur Gough-Calthorpe, K.C.B., C.V.O., as Lord Commissioner of the Admiralty in succession to Vice-Admiral Sir Frederick Hamilton.

— Last day of voluntary recruiting for married men.

8. Proclamation published that Monday in Whitsun week should not be a Bank Holiday.

9. General Joffre, the French Prime Minister, and other French Ministers arrived in London and held a War Council at 10 Downing Street.

10. The Republican Convention at Chicago nominated Mr. Hughes for the Presidential election.

— Announcement that the General Court-Martial in Dublin had found Captain J. C. Bowen Colthurst guilty of having murdered Mr. F. S. Skeffington and two other men, but that he was insane at the time.

13. The King and Queen, and Queen Alexandra, attended a memorial service to Lord Kitchener at St. Paul's Cathedral. Other services were held in Westminster Abbey and other parts of the country.

14-17. Economic Conference of the Allies in Paris.

15. Occupation of Korogwe by Brigadier-General Hannington in East Africa.

— President Wilson was nominated at the St. Louis Convention on behalf of the Democratic Party.

16. H.M. torpedo-boat destroyer *Eden* sank in the Channel as the result of a collision, with the loss of about forty men.

— Secret Session of the French Chamber, to discuss the measures taken by the Higher Command for the defence of Verdun.

17. Capture of Czernovitz by the Russians.

— *The Times* announced the appointment of a Committee under the Chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. J. M. Robertson, M.P., to investigate the principal causes which had led to an increase in the price of commodities, and to recommend any steps likely to relieve the situation.

19. Tribich Lincoln, ex-M.P. for Darlington, was committed for trial at Bow Street Police Court, on charges of forgery.

21. Report that the Grand Sherif of Mecca had proclaimed Arabian independence of Turkey and of Ottoman rule.

— Announcement that the Rev. F. T. Woods had been appointed Bishop of Peterborough.

— Announcement that the Rev. J. V. Macmillan had been appointed Vicar of Kew.

22. Resignation of the Skouloudis Cabinet in Greece; and acceptance by that country of the Allies' demands for demobilisation.

— The V.C. was awarded to Capt. J. A. Sinton, M.B., of the Indian Medical Service, and to Sepoy Chatta Singh for conspicuous bravery in the field.

— Lord Northcliffe was entertained at luncheon at the Hotel Cecil by the Foreign Press Association in London.

23. The Russians completed the occupation of Bukovina.

— The Convention of Ulster Nationalists at Belfast accepted Mr. Lloyd George's scheme for the exclusion of Ulster under the Government of Ireland Act.

— Mr. W. M. Hughes, Prime Minister of Australia, was entertained at dinner by Australians in London, at the Ritz Hotel.

— German torpedo-boats captured the Great Eastern Railway Company's steamer *Brussels* in the North Sea, and took her into Zeebrugge.

24. The second Military Service Act came into operation.

26. Lord Selborne resigned his office as President of the Board of Agriculture.

— War Expenditure Certificates began to be issued at the Bank of England in denominations of 100*l.* and 500*l.*, as well as in the previous denominations of 1,000*l.*, 5,000*l.*, and 10,000*l.*

— Brigadier-General David Mercer, C.B., succeeded General Sir William C. Nicholls, K.C.B., as Adjutant-General of the Royal Marine forces.

— Announcement that Canon Maxwell Gumbleton had been appointed Bishop of Ballarat.

— Beginning of the trial of Sir Roger Casement in the High Court on a charge of high treason, before the Lord Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Avory, and Mr. Justice Horrige, with a jury.

27. Announcement that Mr. J. Bruce Ismay had resigned from his position as Director of the International Mercantile Marine Committee.

28. Announcement that the Duke of Devonshire, K.C., G.C.V.O., had been appointed Governor-General of Canada in succession to the Duke of Connaught.

— The Royal Society of Arts awarded its Albert Medal to Professor Elie Metchnikoff for his researches on immunity.

29. Sir Roger Casement was convicted of high treason, and sentenced to death.

— The late Dowager Lady Dunsany left estate of the gross value of 344,954*l.*

— *The Times*' fund on behalf of the British Red Cross Society reached 4,000,000*l.*

30. Capture of Kolomea by the Russians.

— A letter of Lord Kitchener's calling for more recruits was sold by auction for 6,000*l.*

— Imports during the month of June reached the record figure of 87,000,000*l.*, showing an increase of 11,000,000*l.* on June, 1915. Exports showed an increase of 14,000,000*l.* for the same period.

— The total number of German casualties, officially announced, up to the end of the month was 3,012,637.

JULY.

1. The Franco-British troops started their big offensive against the German positions on the Somme.

— The banks remained closed to the public in all parts of the country, in order that their depleted staffs might attend without interruption to the work of the day.

— Lord Kitchener left unsettled estate of the value of 171,421*l.*

4. The Queen opened a new South London Hospital for Women at Clapham Common.

5. Lord French, Commander-in-Chief of the Home Forces, was appointed Colonel of the Irish Guards.

6. The King conferred an Earldom on Sir Edward Grey, which at the request of Sir Edward was altered to a Viscounty.

— Mr. Lloyd George was appointed Secretary of State for War, with Lord Derby as Under-Secretary.

7. General Smuts occupied Tanga in East Africa.

8. Publication of an Order in Council repudiating the Declaration of London.

10. *The Times* announced the appointments of Mr. E. S. Montagu as Minister of Munitions, of Mr. T. McKinnon Wood as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and of Mr. H. J. Tennant as Secretary for Scotland.

— Lord Curzon became a permanent member of the War Committee.

12. Lord Crawford was appointed President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

13. The King conferred a K.C.B. (civil) on Colonel Arthur Lee, M.P., on account of his services in connexion with the supply of munitions.

14. It was announced that the Council of Trinity College, Cambridge, had removed the Hon. Bertrand Russell from his lectureship in Logic and the Principles of Mathematics, in consequence of his conviction under the Defence of the Realm Act.

— "France's Day" was celebrated in London, and large collections made for the French Red Cross.

18. The King and Queen visited the Convalescent Hospital at Woodcote Park, Epsom, and the County of London War Hospital at Epsom.

— The appeal of Roger Casement against his conviction of high treason was dismissed by the Court of Criminal Appeal.

19. A meeting of representatives of employers in the engineering, shipbuilding, woollen, hosiery, lace, and boot-making trades took place at the Ministry of Munitions, and passed a unanimous vote agreeing to the postponement of holidays.

21. Celebration of "Belgium's Day" in London. At a great patriotic demonstration in the Albert Hall, Mr. Asquith paid a high tribute to the gallantry of the Belgians.

22. Resignation of M. Sazonoff from the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

— *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. C. J. Holmes as a Director of the National Gallery.

— Mr. Cyril Norwood, Headmaster of Bristol Grammar School, was appointed Master of Marlborough College.

24. *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. A. B. Ramsay as Lower Master of Eton.

— The counties of Kent, Surrey, and Sussex came under the liquor restrictions established for scheduled areas.

25. The new restrictions came into operation, under which Inverness and the North of Scotland became a military area, which could not be entered without a permit.

— The estate of the late Sir James Caird, Bart., was valued at 1,446,586*l.* gross.

27. The Earl of Lytton became Civil Lord of the Admiralty in succession to the Duke of Devonshire.

28. Mr. Laurence Ginnell, M.P. for North-West Meath, was fined 100*l.* for an offence under the Defence of the Realm regulations.

31. Mr. Asquith announced the appointment of Mr. Duke, K.C., as Chief Secretary for Ireland.

AUGUST.

1. A licensing system for the supply of petrol came into operation, by which users were submitted to a large reduction in their previous consumption.

2. It was announced in Petrograd that a G.C.B. had been conferred on M. Sazonoff.

— A Zeppelin raid over Norfolk, Sussex, and Essex did scarcely any damage.

3. The King approved the formation of a new corps of Infantry called "The Training Reserve."

— *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. E. C. P. Boyd as a new Metropolitan Police Magistrate.

— Execution of Roger Casement at Pentonville Gaol.

4. The commencement of the third year of the war was celebrated throughout the country. The King and Queen attended a special service at Buckingham Palace.

— A conference representative of the Engineering and Shipbuilding industries of Scotland was held in Glasgow, and decided to form a strong organisation to cope with German competition after the war.

5. Mr. James D. Milner was appointed Director, Keeper, and Secretary of the National Portrait Gallery.

7. *The Times* announced that Lord Wimborne had been appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

— The V.C. was awarded to nine officers and men for distinguished bravery in the field.

— The usual Bank Holiday was not observed throughout the greater part of the country; and the day was treated as one of ordinary work.

9. *The Times* announced that Mr. Arthur Henderson had resigned his office as President of the Board of Education.

— Zeppelin raid on the East Coast, with very slight damage.

10. Capture of Stanislau by the Russians.

12. Two hostile sea-planes appeared over Dover, doing slight damage.

15. The King returned to England after a week's visit to the Armies in France.

17. Sir F. Blake (Coalition) was returned to Parliament for Berwick by 3,794 votes against 621 for Dr. Turnbull (Ind.).

18. A Royal Proclamation was issued, making special restrictions on British exports to Sweden.

19. Submarine E 23 torpedoed the German battleship *Westfalen* in the North Sea.

— The following appointments were announced :—

Lord Crewe as President of the Board of Education.

Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., as Paymaster-General.

Lord Newton as Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

— Announcement that the King had conferred the G.C.V.O. on Sir Douglas Haig, and the G.C.M.G. on Sir Henry Howard.

— The German fleet came out [*v. Hist. of the War*].

21. A new order of the Home Secretary came into force, prohibiting the whistling for cabs in London between the hours of 10 P.M. and 7 A.M.

— General Sir B. Duff, G.C.B., etc., was recalled from India to give evidence before the Mesopotamia Commission; and Lieut.-General (temporary General) Sir C. C. Monro, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., was appointed Commander-in-Chief in India.

— A serious explosion occurred at a munition factory in Yorkshire.

— Mr. Lloyd George stated that the number of able-bodied German prisoners of war in the United Kingdom and France was 23,142.

22. Occupation of Kilossa in East Africa.

23. A hostile airship crossed the East coast, but caused no damage.

24. Airships attacked the East and South-East coasts, without causing damage.

— H.M. armed boarding steamer *Duke of Albany* was torpedoed and sunk in the North Sea.

— Six hostile airships raided the East Coast, killing eight persons, and injuring many others.

27. Italy declared war upon Germany as from August 28.

— Rumania declared war upon Austria.

29. *The Times* announced the appointment of the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman as Vicar of Bradford.

30. Sir Horace Rumbold, Bart., was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Berne.

— The Kaiser dismissed General von Falkenhayn, Chief of the General Staff, and appointed Field-Marshal von Hindenburg in his place.

— The officially admitted German casualties up to this date, excluding naval and colonial casualties, amounted to 3,376,134, of whom 781,547 were killed or died of wounds.

25. The new restrictions came into operation, under which Inverness and the North of Scotland became a military area, which could not be entered without a permit.

— The estate of the late Sir James Caird, Bart., was valued at 1,446,586*l.* gross.

27. The Earl of Lytton became Civil Lord of the Admiralty in succession to the Duke of Devonshire.

28. Mr. Laurence Ginnell, M.P. for North-West Meath, was fined 100*l.* for an offence under the Defence of the Realm regulations.

31. Mr. Asquith announced the appointment of Mr. Duke, K.C., as Chief Secretary for Ireland.

AUGUST.

1. A licensing system for the supply of petrol came into operation, by which users were submitted to a large reduction in their previous consumption.

2. It was announced in Petrograd that a G.C.B. had been conferred on M. Sazonoff.

— A Zeppelin raid over Norfolk, Sussex, and Essex did scarcely any damage.

3. The King approved the formation of a new corps of Infantry called "The Training Reserve."

— *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. E. C. P. Boyd as a new Metropolitan Police Magistrate.

— Execution of Roger Casement at Pentonville Gaol.

4. The commencement of the third year of the war was celebrated throughout the country. The King and Queen attended a special service at Buckingham Palace.

— A conference representative of the Engineering and Shipbuilding industries of Scotland was held in Glasgow, and decided to form a strong organisation to cope with German competition after the war.

5. Mr. James D. Milner was appointed Director, Keeper, and Secretary of the National Portrait Gallery.

7. *The Times* announced that Lord Wimborne had been appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

— The V.C. was awarded to nine officers and men for distinguished bravery in the field.

— The usual Bank Holiday was not observed throughout the greater part of the country; and the day was treated as one of ordinary work.

9. *The Times* announced that Mr. Arthur Henderson had resigned his office as President of the Board of Education.

— Zeppelin raid on the East Coast, with very slight damage.

10. Capture of Stanislau by the Russians.

12. Two hostile sea-planes appeared over Dover, doing slight damage.

15. The King returned to England after a week's visit to the Armies in France.

17. Sir F. Blake (Coalition) was returned to Parliament for Berwick by 3,794 votes against 621 for Dr. Turnbull (Ind.).

18. A Royal Proclamation was issued, making special restrictions on British exports to Sweden.

19. Submarine E 23 torpedoed the German battleship *Westfalen* in the North Sea.

— The following appointments were announced :—

Lord Crewe as President of the Board of Education.

Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., as Paymaster-General.

Lord Newton as Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

— Announcement that the King had conferred the G.C.V.O. on Sir Douglas Haig, and the G.C.M.G. on Sir Henry Howard.

— The German fleet came out [*v. Hist. of the War*].

21. A new order of the Home Secretary came into force, prohibiting the whistling for cabs in London between the hours of 10 P.M. and 7 A.M.

— General Sir B. Duff, G.C.B., etc., was recalled from India to give evidence before the Mesopotamia Commission; and Lieut.-General (temporary General) Sir C. C. Monro, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., was appointed Commander-in-Chief in India.

— A serious explosion occurred at a munition factory in Yorkshire.

— Mr. Lloyd George stated that the number of able-bodied German prisoners of war in the United Kingdom and France was 23,142.

22. Occupation of Kilossa in East Africa.

23. A hostile airship crossed the East coast, but caused no damage.

24. Airships attacked the East and South-East coasts, without causing damage.

— H.M. armed boarding steamer *Duke of Albany* was torpedoed and sunk in the North Sea.

— Six hostile airships raided the East Coast, killing eight persons, and injuring many others.

27. Italy declared war upon Germany as from August 28.

— Rumania declared war upon Austria.

29. *The Times* announced the appointment of the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman as Vicar of Bradford.

30. Sir Horace Rumbold, Bart., was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Berne.

— The Kaiser dismissed General von Falkenhayn, Chief of the General Staff, and appointed Field-Marshal von Hindenburg in his place.

— The officially admitted German casualties up to this date, excluding naval and colonial casualties, amounted to 3,376,134, of whom 781,547 were killed or died of wounds.

SEPTEMBER.

2. Colonel (temporary Brigadier-General) L. A. M. Stopford, C.B., was appointed Commandant of the Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

— Thirteen German airships attacked London and the Eastern counties, killing two persons and injuring thirteen. One of the airships was brought down near Enfield.

5. Opening of the meeting of the British Association at Newcastle.

— The King conferred the V.C. upon Lieut. W. L. Robinson of the Royal Flying Corps, who had brought down the Zeppelin near Enfield on September 2 (*q.v.*).

6. Lieut.-Colonel J. F. Elkington, who had been cashiered in September, 1914, was reinstated by the King in his former rank, in consequence of his gallant conduct while serving in the ranks of the Foreign Legion of the French Army.

11. The V.C. was awarded to twenty officers and men, eight of whom were already dead.

13. A luncheon was given by the West India Club in honour of Sir Edward Morris, Premier of Newfoundland.

15. First use of the heavy armoured cars, nicknamed "tanks."

— The King of Italy conferred upon Sir Douglas Haig the insignia of Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus.

— The King conferred the V.C. upon a boy, John Cornwell, for conspicuous gallantry during the naval action of May 31-June 1. He also conferred the V.C. upon two naval officers.

16. L. W. Asseling, of the Army Clothing Department, was sentenced to five years' penal servitude for fraud in connexion with the delivery of goods for the Army.

18. G. J. Montague, a "viewer" in the Army Clothing Department, was sentenced to eighteen months' hard labour on the charge of accepting a bribe.

20. Sir C. Seely (Coalition) was returned for the Mansfield Division of Nottinghamshire by a majority of 3,141 over Dr. A. Turnbull (Independent).

22. A German sea-plane dropped three bombs near Dover without causing casualties or damage.

23-24. Twelve German airships attacked London and the Eastern counties, killing thirty persons, and injuring 110, mostly in the Metropolitan area. Two of the airships (L 32 and L 33) were brought down in Essex.

25. Seven German airships visited the Eastern counties, killing thirty-six and injuring twenty-seven persons, mainly in the North Midlands.

26. The V.C. was awarded to twelve officers and men ; and the D.S.O. to thirty-six officers, including Captain F. C. Selous, Royal Fusiliers, the African explorer.

27. *The Times* announced the establishment of a Central Medical Board, for the re-examination of recruits. The Board consisted of Colonel E. H. L. Lynden Bell, Colonel Sir Frederick Treves, and Sir James Mackenzie.

29. Sir William Dunn was appointed Lord Mayor of London for the ensuing year.

30. The total number of German casualties reported in official German lists up to this date reached 3,556,018, exclusive of naval and colonial casualties.

OCTOBER.

1. "Summer Time" came to an end ; and the hands of clocks were set back at 3 A.M. to 2 A.M., Greenwich time being thus restored.

— A Zeppelin raid resulted in the destruction of one Zeppelin at Potter's Bar.

4. The King conferred the D.S.O. on Second Lieut. Frederick Sowrey and Second Lieut. Alfred de Bath Brandon, in connexion with their successful attacks on hostile Zeppelins.

— The Cunard steamship *Franconia* was sunk in the Mediterranean by an enemy submarine, with a loss of twelve of her crew.

— The French auxiliary cruiser *Gallia* was torpedoed in the Mediterranean, with a loss of about 600 troops.

6. *The Times* announced the appointment of the Rev. Samuel Bickersteth, D.D., Vicar of Leeds, to be Canon of Canterbury, in succession to the late Dr. Moore.

7. *The Times* announced the following appointments :—

Sir Eric Geddes as Director-General of Military Railways ; Lord Rothermere as Director-General of the Royal Army Clothing Department ; Mr. H. J. Creedy, C.B., M.V.O., as head of a new department in the War Office for the preparation of statistical information ; Captain Cassel, K.C., M.P., as Judge-Advocate-General, in succession to the late Sir T. Milvain, K.C., C.B.

9. It was reported that Captain the Hon. Wilfred Bailey, Grenadier Guards, had received the D.S.O. and been promoted Major.

10. Parliament re-assembled after the Summer Recess.

11. The International News Service was debarred from all facilities for transmission of news, in consequence of the garbled messages which it published in America.

12. *The Times* announced that the Hon. Mr. Justice Scrutton had been appointed a Lord Justice of Appeal in succession to the Right Hon. Sir Walter Phillimore, Bart., resigned ; and that Mr. Henry Alfred McCardie had been appointed a Judge of the High Court of Justice.

— At a by-election in North Ayrshire, Major-General Sir A. Hunter-Weston (Coalition) was elected by a majority of 5,849 over Mr. H. Chalmers (Ind.).

14. *The Times* announced that Sir John Ellerman, Chairman of the various Ellerman lines, was about to acquire the whole of the shares of Messrs. Thomas Wilson, Sons & Co. (Ltd.); the management of the Wilson line still remaining in the hands of Mr. Oswald Sanderson.

— Second Lieut. Wulstan Joseph Tempest received the D.S.O., in connexion with his successful attack upon a hostile airship.

— The Rev. Lord William Gascoyne-Cecil, Rector of Bishops Hatfield, was appointed Bishop of Exeter.

— Canon Sawyer was appointed Head Master of Shrewsbury School.

16. The price of bread reached 10*d.* for the 4 lb. loaf.

19. Celebration of "Our Day"; the proceeds of collections going to the Joint Fund of the British Red Cross Society and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. The total amount raised in London was 71,966*l.* 3*s.* 7*d.*

— The King conferred a military K.C.B. on General Townshend, and other honours on various members of the besieged garrison at Kut.

— Major Carnegie (Coalition) was returned to Parliament for Winchester by a majority of 745 over Mr. H. C. Woods (Ind.).

20. *The Times* announced the sinking of the Cunard liner *Alaunia*.

— The Duke of Connaught arrived in London on the expiry of his term of five years as Governor-General of Canada.

— Mr. Joseph King, M.P. for North Somerset, was fined 100*l.* and 25 guineas costs for offences under the Defence of the Realm Act.

21. A new Government Department was announced for collecting and disseminating commercial intelligence. It was formed by the amalgamation of the Commercial Intelligence Branch and the Exhibitions Branch of the Board of Trade; Sir William Clark, K.C.S.I., C.M.G., being Comptroller-General of the combined Department.

— Count Stürgkh, the Austrian Prime Minister, was shot in Vienna.

22. A hostile sea-plane, after dropping bombs on Sheerness, was shot down and destroyed by naval aircraft.

23. Sir Eric Geddes was appointed Inspector-General of Transportation, in addition to his post as Director-General of Military Railways. Sir Guy Granet, General Manager of the Midland Railway, was appointed Deputy Director-General of Military Railways in the War Office.

— A hostile aeroplane dropped three bombs over Margate.

— A British naval aeroplane brought down an enemy sea-plane off Ostend.

— The minesweeper H.M.S. *Genista* was torpedoed by an enemy submarine, with the loss of all her officers and seventy-three men; twelve men were saved.

25. Sir Douglas Haig was unanimously nominated for the Rectorship of St. Andrews University.

— At an explosion in a munition factory in Kent, two persons were killed and ten seriously burned.

26. The V.C. was awarded to fifteen officers and men, in two cases after death.

30. The King placed York House, St. James's Palace, at the disposal of General Sir William Robertson.

NOVEMBER.

1. Lord Rosebery, speaking in Edinburgh, paid a tribute to the help given to Great Britain by the Dominions, and protested against any idea of a premature peace.

— The increase in the price of food since the beginning of the war was estimated to have reached 78 per cent.

2. The King inspected the new "Household Battalion," formed from the three reserve regiments of Household Cavalry under the command of Col. Wyndham Portal.

3. The best varieties of wheat were sold at Maidstone at 80s. a quarter.

— A collision off Greenore between the *Connemara*, of the London and North Western Railway Co., and the tramp steamer *Retriever*, resulted in the sinking of both ships and the loss of ninety lives, only one person being saved.

5. Storms of wind and rain caused much damage in London and the South of England.

6. The price of the quartern loaf in London was raised from 10d. to 10½d.

— Announcement that Sir Bryan Mahon, K.C.V.O., C.B., D.S.O., had been appointed General Officer Commanding-in-Chief of the Forces in Ireland, in succession to Sir John Maxwell.

— The P. & O. steamer *Arabia* was torpedoed and sunk in the Mediterranean.

7. Mr. Arnold Lupton, formerly M.P. for Sleaford, was fined 100l. on charges of prejudicing His Majesty's relations with foreign powers, and the recruiting of His Majesty's forces.

9. Celebration of Lord Mayor's Day in London.

15. Prince George of Battenberg, elder son of Prince and Princess Louis of Battenberg, was married to Countess Nada Torby, younger daughter of the Grand Duke Michael and Countess Torby.

— *The Times* fund on behalf of the British Red Cross Society and the Order of St. John reached the sum of 5,000,000l.

— The estate of the late Sir Arthur Markham, Bart., was valued at 733,290l.

16. The estate of the late Mr. John Dempster was valued at 432,448l.

18. The Hon. degree of LL.D. was conferred at Cambridge on the Right Hon. W. F. Massey, Prime Minister of New Zealand.

19. Monastir was occupied by the French.

20. *The Times* increased in price from 1d. to 1½d.

21. The Emperor Francis Joseph died at Schönbrunn [v. Obit.]

21. The Germans occupied Craiova, the Headquarters of the Rumanian 1st Army.

— The British hospital ship *Britannic* was sunk in the Zea Channel, in the Ægean Sea, with a loss of over 100 lives.

22. *The Times* announced that the Speaker had appointed Mr. W. Turner Perkins Editor of "Hansard," in place of the late Sir James Dods Shaw.

— The conscription Referendum in Australia resulted in a majority of 61,000 against.

23. The British hospital ship *Braemar Castle* was sunk in the Ægean Sea, without loss of life.

— *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir W. H. Vincent to be an ordinary Member of the Executive Council of the Viceroy of India.

24. The Tsar appointed M. Trepoff Premier of Russia.

— The London County Council refused to renew the Music and Dancing Licence of the New Middlesex Theatre.

27. Hostile Zeppelins dropped bombs over the Northern counties, without causing any damage. Two of the Zeppelins were brought down in flames at sea.

28. *The Times* announced the appointment of a committee, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Stanley Leathes, C.B., to consider schemes for reforming the examination for Class I. of the Home Civil Service.

29. *The Times* announced that Mr. J. H. Campbell, K.C., M.P., had been appointed Lord Chief Justice of Ireland in place of the Right Hon. R. R. Cherry, resigned; and that the Earl of Ronaldshay, M.P., had been appointed Governor of Bengal, in succession to Lord Carmichael of Skirling, whose term of office was due to expire in April, 1917.

— The estate of the late Lord Llangattock was valued at 1,100,000*l*.

30. At an extraordinary general meeting of Reuter's Telegram Company, a resolution was approved for the sale of the undertaking, property, and assets of the Company to the Hon. Mark Napier, Lord Glenconner, Lord Peel, and Sir L. Starr Jameson.

DECEMBER.

1. Krupp's Munition Works declared a dividend of 12 per cent.

4. Major-General Sir Stanley von Donop, K.C.B., vacated the post of Master-General of the Ordnance, and was succeeded by Major-General W. T. Furse, C.B., D.S.O.

5. Resignation of Mr. Asquith.

— End of the trial of the Amalgamated Properties of Rhodesia (1913) (Limited) *v.* The Globe and Phoenix Gold Mining Company. The action was dismissed with costs against the plaintiffs, after having occupied the Court 145 days.

6. Capture of Bukarest by the Germans.

6. At an explosion in a National Munion Factory in the North of England, 26 women workers were killed and about 30 injured.

7. T. A. Jackson was sentenced to three years' penal servitude, on a charge of demanding money with menaces from the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company (Limited) and from Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, and of offering to prevent the publication of certain matters, with intent to extort money.

8. *The Times* announced that Admiral the Hon. Sir Alexander E. Bethell, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., had been appointed Commander-in-Chief at Plymouth in succession to Vice-Admiral Sir George J. S. Warrender, Bart., K.C.B., K.C.V.O., who had been relieved on account of ill-health; and that Acting Vice-Admiral the Hon. Sir Somerset A. Gough-Calthorpe, K.C.B., C.V.O., had been appointed Admiral Commanding Coast Guard and Reserves, in succession to Admiral the Hon. Sir Alexander E. Bethell.

11. *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P., as President of the Trade Board of Film Censors, in place of the late Mr. G. A. Redford.

12. General Gouraud was appointed Resident-General of Morocco in place of General Lyautey.

— Captain C. Bathurst, M.P., was appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Food Control Department.

14. The House of Lords dismissed the appeal of C. E. E. Slingsby, claiming a declaration that he was the lawful child of Commander Slingsby, and was therefore entitled on the death of his father to the Slingsby family estates.

18. The Regulation of Meals Order (1916) came into force, limiting meals at public eating places to three courses between 6 and 9.30 P.M., and to two courses at any other time.

— The following peerages were announced: The Rt. Hon. Charles Stuart-Wortley, M.P., and Sir Max Aitken, M.P.

19. The Rev. G. E. Newsom was appointed Vicar of Newcastle. The Rev. C. E. Lambert was appointed Vicar of All Hallows, Barking, in place of Dr. A. W. Robinson who had become a Canon of Canterbury.

— 20 per cent. was paid in London for an insurance providing for the payment of a claim should peace be declared by June 30, 1917.

21. Two of H.M. torpedo-boat destroyers were sunk in collision in the North Sea, with a loss of 49 lives.

— The "Resignation Honours" were announced, five new peerages being created: *viz.*, The Rt. Hon. Lewis Harcourt, M.P., The Rt. Hon. Joseph A. Pease, M.P., Sir John A. Dewar, Bart., M.P., Sir Thomas Roe, M.P., and Sir Edward Partington. The new Baronets included the Rt. Hon. James H. Campbell, K.C., M.P., and Sir Jesse Boot.

— The Rt. Hon. James H. Campbell, K.C., M.P., was appointed Attorney-General for Ireland, in succession to the Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry, K.C., who had resigned on account of ill-health.

26. The French Government conferred upon General Joffre the distinction of *Maréchal de France*.

27. The French battleship *Gaulois* was torpedoed by a submarine in the Mediterranean, and 4 lives were lost.

— Thick fog in London.

28. The constitution of the new Army Council was announced in the *London Gazette* as follows: Lord Derby, President; Gen. Sir William Robertson, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., D.S.O.; Lieut.-Gen. Sir J. S. Cowans, K.C.B., M.V.O.; Lieut.-Gen. Sir Cecil F. N. Macready, K.C.B., K.C.M.G.; Maj.-Gen. (Temp. Lieut.-Gen.) Sir David Henderson, K.C.B., D.S.O.; Maj.-Gen. W. T. Furse, C.B., D.S.O.; Maj.-Gen. R. D. Whigham, C.B., D.S.O.; J. I. Macpherson, Esq.; and H. W. Forster, Esq.

— Alderman J. D. Kiley was returned unopposed for the Parliamentary vacancy in the Whitechapel Division created by the resignation of Sir Stuart Samuel.

29. *The Times* announced that Lord Devonport had appointed Sir Henry Rew, K.C.B., to be Secretary to the Ministry of Food, and Mr. W. H. Beveridge, C.B., to be Second Secretary.

— Sir William Collins was returned unopposed for Derby, in place of Sir Thomas Roe, who had been raised to the Peerage.

— Mr. Christopher Johnston, K.C., was returned unopposed for the Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities, in place of Lord Finlay.

30. *The Times* announced the resignation of Lord Sydenham from the Air Board.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON VENEREAL DISEASES, APPOINTED IN NOVEMBER, 1913. (PUBLISHED MARCH 3.)

Among the general conclusions set forth are these :—

1. In distribution the incidence of syphilis is much higher in urban than in rural areas. The same is probably true of gonorrhœa, though statistical proof is not available to the same extent.
2. The available statistics afford no satisfactory evidence of the prevalence of venereal diseases, but in the large cities it is estimated that at least 10 per cent. of the population are affected by syphilis and a much higher proportion are affected by gonorrhœa.
3. Venereal diseases can be controlled and reduced within narrow limits by early and efficient treatment, but at present treatment is in most cases unduly deferred and adequate facilities for the best modern treatment do not exist.
4. To bring modern methods of treatment to bear on every infected person Government action is essential.

The effect of the recommendations of the Commission may be summarised thus :—

1. Arrangements should be made for accurate statistical records of the prevalence of disease, including the confidential registration of causes of death.
2. Facilities for the diagnosis and free treatment of venereal disease should be organised by the larger local authorities (county councils and county borough councils), the Imperial Exchequer to contribute 75 per cent. of the cost.
3. No system of notification of venereal disease should be adopted for the present.
4. Advertisements of remedies for venereal diseases should be prohibited.
5. Legal protection should be given to medical men to enable them to make confidential communications with the object of preventing or delaying a marriage on the ground of venereal disease.
6. Infectious venereal disease should be made a statutory incapacity for marriage; and the children of such a marriage should be relieved of the disabilities of illegitimacy.
7. More careful instruction in regard to moral conduct in sexual relations should be provided throughout all types and grades of education.

THE REPORT.

The report is signed by all the Commissioners — namely, Lord Sydenham (Chairman), Sir D. Brynmor Jones, Sir Kenelm Digby, Sir Almeric FitzRoy, Sir Malcolm Morris, F.R.C.S. Edin., Sir John Collie, M.D., Dr. Arthur Newsholme, Canon J. W. Horsley, the Rev. Dr. J. Scott Lidgett, Dr. F. W. Mott, Dr. Mary Scharlieb, Mr. James E. Lane, F.R.C.S. Eng., Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., Mrs. Creighton, and Mrs. Elizabeth Burgwin. The signatures of Sir Kenelm Digby and Canon Horsley are subject to reservations.

The disadvantage of issuing the report “when all public activities are preoccupied in fulfilling the manifold needs of the war” is recognised. But it has been published because “the conditions now existing and those which must follow on the conclusion of the war imperatively require that action should be taken without delay. The Report proceeds :—

“There is no reason to believe that the percentage of infection in the naval and military forces is now greater than in normal times ; but there can be no doubt that the total of infected persons has increased. The military authorities are doing their utmost to provide treatment, but the civil population requires corresponding measures, and all experience shows that after a war an excessive incidence of disease is certain to occur, even in districts previously free. . . . We are therefore convinced that it will not suffice to establish treatment centres in places where sailors and soldiers are congregated, and that these will be needed in most of the larger and in some of the smaller towns. We realise the claims of economy at the present moment ; but for reasons we have given, we believe that all necessary expenditure will be recouped by the results which can be obtained.”

The Commissioners found that, except in the case of the Navy and Army, there are at present no means of arriving at an accurate estimate of the prevalence of venereal diseases. The tendency to concealment, by militating alike against the acquisition of full knowledge of the extent of their incidence and against the prompt treatment which is so necessary, render them peculiarly dangerous to public health. Moreover, it is only in comparatively recent years that their varied effects have begun to be recognised, while more in this direction still remains to be discovered. Partial attempts to obtain a local census of venereal diseases have been made in some countries ; but the results are not such as to justify generalisations. A large number of examinations in institutions, and among special sections of the population, including *post-mortem* tests, have been made in the United Kingdom, as in foreign countries, and generally show an unexpectedly large prevalence. The recorded death-rate in this country per million for syphilis and three consequential diseases, distributed among eight classified groups of the population shows the prevalence to be greatest in the unskilled labour class, and least amongst miners and agricultural labourers. But at present registration is defective, many deaths due to this cause escaping recognition. Sir William Osler considers that “of the killing diseases syphilis comes third or fourth.” While unable to arrive at any positive figures, the

Commissioners come to the conclusion that the persons who have been infected with syphilis, acquired or congenital, cannot fall below 10 per cent. of the whole population in the large cities, and the percentage affected with gonorrhœa must greatly exceed this proportion.

A striking section of the report shows that both the diseases named lead to an enormous annual loss of child life. It is estimated that from 30 to 50 per cent. of sterility among women is due to gonorrhœa, and of registered still-births probably at least half are due to syphilis. Of 1,100 children in the London County Council schools for the blind, at least 55·6 per cent. of the cases are attributable to venereal diseases in the parents. A large proportion of juvenile cases of imbecility, idiocy, deafness, and various forms of skin, bone, and other diseases result from congenital syphilis. It is shown that among adults the loss of working power from the earlier effects of the diseases is important, while in their later manifestations they are responsible for a vast amount of incapacity. In a considerable proportion of cases syphilis, at an average period of ten to fifteen years after infection, shows itself as general paralysis of the insane or locomotor ataxy.

Reference is made to the heavy cost of the public maintenance of persons thus afflicted, and the total economic loss is justly described as "enormous." The Commissioners are satisfied that a large proportion of the total expenditure can be saved, and will far more than counter-balance the cost of the measures they propose.

By the terms of reference Lord Sydenham and his colleagues were precluded from considering the policy of the much controverted Contagious Diseases Acts of 1864 and 1866, which were repealed in 1886 ; but they place on record their view that no advantage would accrue from a return to the system. So far from this being the case, it is to be noted that the great improvement as regards these diseases in the fighting services has taken place since the repeal of the Acts. Except in the case of those services, the Commissioners find that the existing facilities for treatment are "extremely deficient." They are of opinion that no adequate system of treatment will be organised unless responsibility for it is undertaken by the State. Measures should be taken to render the best modern treatment readily available for the whole community, by the use of special wards in the general hospitals, rather than by the establishment of separate institutions. In reference to the objections still persisting in the minds of some subscribers to general hospitals, the report expresses the hope that "when the facts elicited by our inquiry are made public, the view that morality can be encouraged by denying medical treatment to those who, by violating its laws, have become a public danger will disappear."

Subject to the approval of the Local Government Board, the councils of counties and county boroughs should organise and carry into effect definite schemes for dealing with the diseases, and as a first step should approach the general hospitals in their areas with a view to making the necessary arrangements. Treatment at any institution should not be restricted to persons resident in a particular area ; it should be free to all, and there should be no refusal to treat a patient who is unwilling to go to his own doctor. Special arrangements, such

as evening clinics, should be made for the treatment of out-patients at hours convenient to the working classes. Subject to proper safeguards, local authorities should be empowered to supply salvarsan or its substitutes gratuitously to medical practitioners.

Extended facilities should be made available for diagnosis by laboratory methods, and be organised by the larger local authorities, the fullest use being made of the laboratory facilities at universities and hospitals. The Commissioners recommend that one-fourth of the public expenditure for these purposes should be met from local rates, and that the remaining three-fourths should be provided by Imperial grants, distributed by the Local Government Board.

Generally speaking, the Commissioners have been slow to advocate compulsion in any form. For example, they report against any system of compulsory personal notification, believing that it would fail to secure the advantages claimed, and that better results may be obtained by the improved facilities for treatment which they recommend, and by a policy of education regarding the serious nature of these diseases. It is in respect to one limited form of compulsion that the only departures are made from the unanimity of this report. Sir Kenelm Digby and Canon Horsley attach reservations objecting to the proposed detention of Poor Law patients suffering from these diseases, and the former is not prepared to support the thorough medical examination of persons committed to prison recommended by his colleagues. It may be remarked that the principle of detention in Poor Law institutions in cases of diseases dangerous to the community was laid down in the Poor Law Act of 1867. While holding the case for the similar detention of prisoners to be a strong one, the report accepts the opinion that it would be more expedient to rely on the co-operation of Discharged Prisoners' Aid Associations and similar bodies in any general system of free treatment. It is suggested that when an infectious man is entitled to claim his discharge from the Army or Navy he should be encouraged in his own interest to continue under treatment.

The unanimous proposal of the Divorce Commission that statutory recognition should be given to the principle that infectious venereal disease constitutes an incapacity for marriage and should be a ground for divorce is strongly endorsed. If under the existing law the effect of a decree of nullity is to render the children illegitimate, it should be provided that the disabilities attaching to such a condition should not follow. Another amendment of the law recommended is that a communication made *bona fide* by a medical practitioner to a parent, guardian, or other person directly interested in the welfare of a woman or man, and with the object of preventing or delaying a marriage with a person who is in an infectious condition, shall be a privileged communication.

Measures are proposed to ensure that every medical student has adequate practical instruction in these diseases. Their treatment by unqualified persons is emphatically condemned as disastrous, and constituting one of the principal hindrances to eradication. The recommendation of the Select Committee on Patent Medicines that all advertisements of remedies for these diseases should be prohibited is

endorsed. Approved societies which debar from sick benefits persons whose illness is due to misconduct, but freely admit those who are suffering from consequential diseases, which early treatment would have prevented, are urged to revise their practice.

"There can be little doubt that a franker attitude towards these diseases would lead to less concealment, often involving recourse to quack remedies, which may retard cure or render it impossible, and would thus assist in checking one of the greatest evils that can afflict a community."

A section of the report is devoted to the important question of public education in these matters. More careful instruction should be provided in regard to moral conduct as bearing upon sexual relations throughout all types and grades of education. It should be based on moral principles and spiritual considerations, and not merely on the physical consequences of immoral conduct. The National Council for Combating Venereal Diseases should be recognised by Government as an authoritative body for the purpose of spreading knowledge and giving advice.

As regards anti-syphilitic drugs, it is pointed out that mercury and arsenic have proved their value in the past. Salvarsan (606) belongs to the arsenic group. It is a German product and substitutes have been prepared, the most important of which are Kharsivan and neo-Kharsivan and arsenobenzol-Billon, English and French products respectively. Reports of the use of these drugs are to hand and are very satisfactory. It is pointed out that syphilis can be cured if promptly treated by a doctor, and it is recommended that the public should be informed that the disease may be acquired by kissing and by using the same eating or drinking utensils or tobacco pipes as a syphilitic person. The statistics of the social distribution of the disease appear to show that unskilled labourers head the list. Next comes "intermediate labour," and then the upper and middle classes. At the bottom of the list are miners and agricultural labourers.

DESPATCH FROM GENERAL SIR CHARLES MONRO, DESCRIBING
THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE ALLIED TROOPS FROM THE
GALLIPOLI PENINSULA, AND THE LANDING OF THE TROOPS
AT SALONIKA. (PUBLISHED APRIL 11.)

HEADQUARTERS, 1ST ARMY,
FRANCE, *March 6, 1916.*

MY LORD,—

I have the honour to submit herewith a brief account of the operations in the Eastern Mediterranean from the 28th October, 1915, on which date I assumed command of the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force, until the 9th January, 1916, when in compliance with your directions, I handed over charge at Cairo to Lieut.-General Sir Archibald Murray, K.C.B., C.V.O., D.S.O.

On the 20th October in London, I received your Lordship's instructions to proceed as soon as possible to the near East and take over the command of the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force.

My duty on arrival was in broad outline:—

- (a) To report on the military situation on the Gallipoli Peninsula.
- (b) To express an opinion whether on purely military grounds the Peninsula should be evacuated, or another attempt made to carry it.
- (c) The number of troops that would be required
 - (1) to carry the Peninsula,
 - (2) to keep the Straits open, and
 - (3) to take Constantinople.

Two days after my arrival at Imbros, where the headquarters of the M.E.F. was established, I proceeded to the Peninsula to investigate the military situation. The impressions I gathered are summarised very shortly as follows:—

The positions occupied by our troops presented a military situation unique in history. The mere fringe of the coast-line had been secured. The beaches and piers upon which they depended for all requirements in personnel and material were exposed to registered and observed Artillery fire. Our entrenchments were dominated almost throughout by the Turks. The possible Artillery positions were insufficient and defective. The Force, in short, held a line possessing every possible military defect. The position was without depth, the communications were insecure and dependent on the weather. No means existed for the concealment and deployment of fresh troops destined for the offensive—whilst the Turks enjoyed full powers of observation, abundant Artillery positions, and they had been given the time to supplement the natural advantages which the position presented by all the devices at the disposal of the Field Engineer.

Another material factor came prominently before me. The troops on the Peninsula had suffered much from various causes.

(a) It was not in the first place possible to withdraw them from the shell-swept area as is done when necessary in France, for every corner on the Peninsula is exposed to hostile fire.

(b) They were much enervated from the diseases which are endemic in that part of Europe in the summer.

(c) In consequence of the losses which they had suffered in earlier battles there was a very grave dearth of officers competent to take command of men.

(d) In order to maintain the numbers needed to hold the front, the Territorial Divisions had been augmented by the attachment of Yeomanry and Mounted Brigades. Makeshifts of this nature very obviously did not tend to create efficiency. Other arguments, irrefutable in their conclusions, convinced me that a complete evacuation was the only wise course to pursue.

(a) It was obvious that the Turks could hold us in front with a small force and prosecute their designs on Baghdad or Egypt, or both.

(b) An advance from the positions we held could not be regarded as a reasonable military operation to expect.

(c) Even had we been able to make an advance in the Peninsula, our position would not have been ameliorated to any marked degree, and an advance on Constantinople was quite out of the question.

(d) Since we could not hope to achieve any purpose by remaining on

the Peninsula, the appalling cost to the nation involved in consequence of embarking on an Overseas Expedition with no base available for the rapid transit of stores, supplies, and personnel, made it urgent that we should divert the troops locked up on the Peninsula to a more useful theatre.

Since, therefore, I could see no military advantage in our continued occupation of positions on the Peninsula, I telegraphed to your Lordship that in my opinion the evacuation of the Peninsula should be taken in hand.

Subsequently I proceeded to Egypt to confer with Colonel Sir H. McMahon, the High Commissioner, and Lieut.-General Sir J. Maxwell, Commanding the Forces in Egypt, over the situation which might be created in Egypt and in the Arab world by the evacuation of the Peninsula.

Whilst in Egypt I was ordered by a telegram from the War Office to take command of the troops at Salonika. The purport of this telegram was subsequently cancelled by your Lordship on your arrival at Mudros, and I was then ordered to assume Command of the Forces in the Mediterranean, east of Malta, and exclusive of Egypt.

Consequent on these instructions, I received approval that the two Forces in the Mediterranean should be designated as follows:—

(a) The original Mediterranean Expeditionary Force, which comprised the Forces operating on the Gallipoli Peninsula and those employed at Mudros and Imbros as the "Dardanelles Army," under Lieut.-General Sir W. Birdwood, K.C.B., etc., with headquarters at Imbros.

(b) The troops destined for Salonika as the "Salonika Army," under Lieut.-General Sir B. Mahon, K.C.B., with headquarters at Salonika.

The Staff of the original M.E.F. was left in part to form the Dardanelles Army, and the remainder were taken to make a General Headquarters Staff for the increased responsibilities now assumed. Other officers doing duty in this theatre with the necessary qualifications were selected, and, with no difficulty or demands on home resources, a thoroughly efficient and adequate Staff was created.

Mudros was selected as being the most suitable site for the establishment of headquarters, as affording an opportunity, in addition to other advantages, of daily consultation with the Inspector-General, Line of Communications. The working of the services of the Line of Communications presented difficulties of an unique character, mainly owing to

(a) the absence of pier and wharfage accommodation at Mudros and the necessity of transferring all Ordnance and Engineer Stores from one ship to another;

(b) the submarine danger;

(c) the delay caused by rough weather.

Close association with General Altham was therefore most imperative, and by this means many important changes were made which conduced to greater efficiency and more prompt response to the demands of fighting units.

A narrative of the events which occurred in each of the two Armies is now recorded separately for facility of perusal and reference.

SALONIKA ARMY.

Early in October the 10th Division, under Lieut.-General Sir B. Mahon, K.C.B., was transferred from Suvla to Salonika, and fully concentrated there. The dislocation of units caused by the landing on the Peninsula and the subsequent heavy fighting which occurred prevented this Division being despatched intact. The organisation of the Infantry and the Royal Engineers was not disturbed, but the other services had to be improvised from other Divisions as found most accessible.

The arrival of the 10th Division had been preceded by two French Divisions under General Sarraill, whose Force was subsequently augmented by another Division. These three Divisions were then moved into Serbia under the understanding arranged between the Allied Governments, which was to the effect that the French Forces were to protect the railway between Krivolak and Veles, and to ensure communication with the Serbian Army, whilst the British were to maintain the position from Salonika to Krivolak, and to support the French Right. If communication with the Serbian Army could not be opened and maintained, the Allied Forces were to be withdrawn.

With this object, two Battalions of the 10th Division were moved from Salonika on 27th October, and took over the French front from Kosturino to Lake Doiran. The remainder of the Division was sent to Serbia on 12th November and following days, and took over the French front eastwards from Kosturino.

The task of moving troops into Serbia and maintaining them there presented many difficulties. No road exists from Salonika to Doiran, a few miles of road then obtains, which is followed within a few miles by a track only suitable for pack transport. Sir B. Mahon had therefore to readjust his transport to a pack scale, and was dependent on a railway of uncertain carrying power to convey back his guns and all wheeled traffic in case of a withdrawal, and to supply his troops whilst in Serbia.

Very soon afterwards reinforcements commenced to arrive. The disembarkation of these new divisions was an operation which taxed the powers of organisation and resources of the Staff at Salonika to the highest degree possible, and it speaks highly for their capacity that they were able to shelter and feed the troops as they arrived.

During November and the early part of December the 10th Division was holding its position in Serbia, and the disembarkation of other divisions was proceeding with difficulty.

In order to gain time for the landing of the troops, and their deployment on the positions selected, I represented to General Sarraill and Sir B. Mahon the urgent need of the divisions withdrawing from Serbia being utilised as a covering force, and retaining their ground as such until the Forces disembarking were thoroughly in a position to hold their front.

It had been evident for some time that the power of resistance of the Serbian Armies was broken, and that the Allied Forces could afford them no material assistance. It was also clear from all information received that the position of our troops was becoming daily more precarious owing to a large German-Bulgarian concentration in the Strumnitza Valley. I, therefore, again pressed General Sarraill to proceed with his withdrawal from the positions he was holding. The British Division, operating as it was as the pivot upon which the withdrawal was effected, was compelled to hold its ground until the French Left was brought back.

Before our withdrawal was completed the 10th Division was heavily attacked on the 6th, 7th, and 8th December by superior Bulgarian Forces. The troops had suffered considerably from the cold in the Highlands of Macedonia, and in the circumstances conducted themselves very creditably in being able to extricate themselves from a difficult position with no great losses. The account of this action was reported by wire to you by General Mahon on the 11th December: no further reference is therefore necessary to this incident.

As soon as I was informed that the 10th Division was being heavily pressed, I directed Sir B. Mahon to send a Brigade up the railway line in support, and to hold another Brigade ready to proceed at short notice. The withdrawal was, however, conducted into Greek territory without further opposition from the Bulgarians.

Meanwhile, the operation of disembarkation at Salonika was being carried out with all possible speed, and the Greek Authorities through their representative from Athens, Colonel Pallis, were informed by me that we intended to proceed to the defensive line selected. This intimation was received in good part by the Greek Generals. They commenced to withdraw their troops further to the East where they did not hamper our plans, and they showed a disposition to meet our demands in a reasonable and friendly spirit.

Whilst dealing with the events above enumerated, I desire to give special prominence to the difficulties to which General Sir B. Mahon was exposed from the time of his landing at Salonika, and the ability which he displayed in overcoming them. The subjoined instances, selected from many which could be given, will illustrate my contention, and the high standard of administrative capacity displayed by the G.O.C. and his Staff:—

(a) From the date on which the 10th Division first proceeded into Serbia until the date of its withdrawal across the Greek frontier, personnel, guns, supplies, and material of all kinds had to be sent up by rail to Doiran, and onwards by march, motor lorries, limbered waggons, and pack animals. This railway, moreover, was merely a single track, and had to serve the demands of the local population as well as our needs. The evacuation of the wounded and sick had to be arranged on similar lines, yet the requirements of the troops were fully satisfied.

(b) The majority of the Divisions were sent without trains to Salonika, most units without first line transport; in spite of this, part of the Force was converted into a mobile condition with very little delay.

(c) The complications represented by the distribution and checking of stores, supplies, ammunition, etc., discharged from ships on to quays, with insufficient accommodation or storehouses, and with crude means of ingress and egress therefrom, and served by a single road which was divided between the French and ourselves, constituted a problem which could only be solved by officers of high administrative powers. I trust, therefore, that full recognition may be given to my recommendation of the officers who rendered such fine service under such arduous conditions.

DARDANELLES ARMY.

On my arrival in the Mediterranean theatre a gratifying decline in the high rate of sickness which had prevailed in the Force during the summer months had become apparent. The wastage due to this cause still, however, remained very high.

The Corps Commanders were urged to take all advantage of the improved weather conditions to strengthen their positions by all available means, and to reduce to the last degree possible all animals not actually required for the maintenance of the troops, in order to relieve the strain imposed on the Naval Transport Service.

During the month of November, beyond the execution of very clever and successful minor enterprises carried out by Corps Commanders with a view to maintaining an offensive spirit in their commands, there remains little to record—except that an increased activity of the Turkish Artillery against our front became a noticeable factor.

On the 21st November the Peninsula was visited by a storm said to be nearly unprecedented for the time of the year. The storm was accompanied by torrential rain, which lasted for 24 hours. This was followed by hard frost and a heavy blizzard. In the areas of the 8th Corps and the Anzac Corps the effects were not felt to a very marked degree owing to the protection offered by the surrounding hills. The 9th Corps was less favourably situated, the watercourses in this area became converted into surging rivers, which carried all before them. The water rose in many places to the height of the parapets and all means of communications were prevented. The men, drenched as they were by the rain, suffered from the subsequent blizzard most severely. Large numbers collapsed from exposure and exhaustion, and in spite of untiring efforts that were made to mitigate the suffering, I regret to announce that there were 200 deaths from exposure and over 10,000 sick evacuated during the first few days of December.

From reports given by deserters it is probable that the Turks suffered even to a greater degree.

In this period our flimsy piers, breakwaters, and light shipping became damaged by the storm to a degree which might have involved most serious consequences, and was a very potent indication of the dangers attached to the maintenance and supply of an army operating on a coast-line with no harbour, and devoid of all the accessories such as wharves, piers, cranes, and derricks for the discharge and distribution of stores, etc.

Towards the latter end of the month, having in view the possibility

of an evacuation of the Peninsula being ordered, I directed Lieut.-General Sir W. Birdwood, Commanding the Dardanelles Army, to prepare a scheme to this end, in order that all details should be ready in case of sanction being given to this operation.

I had in broad outline contemplated soon after my arrival on the Peninsula that an evacuation could best be conducted by a sub-division into three stages.

The first, during which all troops, animals, and supplies not required for a long campaign should be withdrawn.

The second to comprise the evacuation of all men, guns, animals, and stores not required for defence during a period when the conditions of weather might retard the evacuation, or in fact seriously alter the programme contemplated.

The third or final stage, in which the troops on shore should be embarked with all possible speed, leaving behind such guns, animals, and stores needed for military reasons at this period.

This problem with which we were confronted was the withdrawal of an army of a considerable size from positions in no cases more than 300 yards from the enemy's trenches, and its embarkation on open beaches, every part of which was within effective range of Turkish guns, and from which in winds from the south or south-west the withdrawal of troops was not possible.

The attitude which we should adopt from a naval and military point of view in case of withdrawal from the Peninsula being ordered, had given me much anxious thought. According to text-book principles and the lessons to be gathered from history it seemed essential that this operation of evacuation should be immediately preceded by a combined naval and military feint in the vicinity of the Peninsula, with a view to distracting the attention of the Turks from our intention. When endeavouring to work out into concrete fact how such principles could be applied to the situation of our Forces, I came to the conclusion that our chances of success were infinitely more probable if we made no departure of any kind from the normal life which we were following both on sea and on land. A feint which did not fully fulfil its purpose would have been worse than useless, and there was the obvious danger that the suspicion of the Turks would be aroused by our adoption of a course the real purport of which could not have been long disguised.

On the 8th December, consequent on your Lordship's orders, I directed the General Officer Commanding Dardanelles Army to proceed with the evacuation of Suvla and Anzac at once.

Rapidity of action was imperative, having in view the unsettled weather which might be expected in the *Ægean*. The success of our operations was entirely dependent on weather conditions. Even a mild wind from the south or south-west was found to raise such a ground swell as to greatly impede communication with the beaches, while anything in the nature of a gale from this direction could not fail to break up the piers, wreck the small craft, and thus definitely prevent any steps being taken towards withdrawal.

We had, moreover, during the gale of the 21st November, learnt how entirely we were at the mercy of the elements with the slender and

inadequate means at our disposal by which we had endeavoured to improvise harbours and piers. On that day the harbour at Kephalos was completely wrecked, one of the ships which had been sunk to form a breakwater was broken up, and the whole of the small craft sheltered inside the breakwater were washed ashore. Similar damage was done to our piers, lighters, and small craft at Suvla and Anzac.

Lieut.-General Birdwood proceeded on receipt of his orders with the skill and promptitude which is characteristic of all that he undertakes, and after consultation with Rear-Admiral Wemyss, it was decided, provided the weather was propitious, to complete the evacuation on the night of the 19th-20th December.

Throughout the period 10th to 18th December the withdrawal proceeded under the most auspicious conditions, and the morning of the 18th December found the positions both at Anzac and Suvla reduced to the numbers determined, while the evacuation of guns, animals, stores, and supplies had continued most satisfactory.

The arrangements for the final withdrawal made by Corps Commanders were as follows:—

It was imperative, of course, that the front line trenches should be held, however lightly, until the very last moment, and that the withdrawal from these trenches should be simultaneous throughout the line. To ensure this being done, Lieut.-General Sir W. Birdwood arranged that the withdrawal of the inner flanks of corps should be conducted to a common embarking area under the orders of the G.O.C. 9th Corps.

In the rear of the front line trenches at Suvla the General Officer Commanding 9th Corps broke up his area into two sections divided roughly by the Salt Lake. In the Southern Section a defensive line had been prepared from the Salt Lake to the sea, and Lala Baba had been prepared for defence; on the left the second line ran from Kara Kol Dagħ through Hill 10 to the Salt Lake. These lines were only to be held in case of emergency—the principle governing the withdrawal being that the troops should proceed direct from the trenches to the distributing centres near the beach, and that no intermediate positions should be occupied except in case of necessity.

At Anzac, owing to the proximity of the trenches to the beach, no second position was prepared except at Anzac Cove, where a small keep was arranged to cover the withdrawal of the rearmost parties in case of necessity.

The good fortune which had attended the evacuation continued during the night of the 19th-20th. The night was perfectly calm with a slight haze over the moon, an additional stroke of good luck, as there was a full moon on that night.

Soon after dark the covering ships were all in position, and the final withdrawal began. At 1.30 A.M. the withdrawal of the rear parties commenced from the front trenches at Suvla and the left of Anzac. Those on the right of Anzac, who were nearer the beach, remained in position until 2 A.M. By 5.30 A.M. the last man had quitted the trenches.

At Anzac four 18-pounder guns, two 5-inch howitzers, one 4.7 Naval gun, one anti-aircraft, and two 3-pounder Hotchkiss guns, were left, but they were destroyed before the troops finally embarked. In addition,

fifty-six mules, a certain number of carts, mostly stripped of their wheels, and some supplies which were set on fire, were also abandoned.

At Suvla every gun, vehicle, and animal was embarked, and all that remained was a small stock of supplies which was burnt.

Early in December orders had been issued for the withdrawal of the French troops on Helles, other than their artillery, and a portion of the line held by French Creoles had already been taken over by the Royal Naval Division on the 12th December. On the 21st December, having strengthened the 8th Corps with the 86th Brigade, the number of the French garrison doing duty on the Peninsula was reduced to 4,000 men. These it was hoped to relieve early in January, but before doing so it was necessary to give some respite from trench work to the 42nd Division, which was badly in need of a rest. My intention, therefore, was first to relieve the 42nd Division by the 86th Brigade, then to bring up the 13th Division which was resting at Imbros since the evacuation of Suvla, in place of the 29th Division, and finally to bring up the 11th Division in relief of the French. Helles would then be held by the 52nd, 11th, and 13th Divisions, with the Royal Naval Division and the 42nd Division in reserve on adjacent islands.

On the 24th December, General Sir W. Birdwood was directed to make all preliminary preparations for immediate evacuation, in the event of orders to this effect being received.

On 28th December your Lordship's telegram ordering the evacuation of Helles was received, whereupon, in view of the possibility of bad weather intervening, I instructed the General Officer Commanding Dardanelles Army to complete the operation as rapidly as possible. He was reminded that every effort conditional on not exposing the personnel to undue risk should be made to save all 60-pounder and 18-pounder guns, 6-inch and 4.5 howitzers, with their ammunition and other accessories, such as mules and A.T. carts, limbered waggons, etc. In addition, I expressed my wish that the final evacuation should be completed in one night, and that the troops should withdraw direct from the front trenches to the beaches, and not occupy any intermediate position unless seriously molested. At a meeting which was attended by the Vice-Admiral and the General Officer Commanding Dardanelles Army, I explained the course which I thought we should adopt to again deceive the Turks as to our intentions. The situation on the Peninsula had not materially changed owing to our withdrawal from Suvla and Anzac, except that there was a marked increased activity in aerial reconnaissance over our positions, and the islands of Mudros and Imbros, and that hostile patrolling of our trenches was more frequent and daring. The most apparent factor was that the number of heavy guns on the European and Asiatic shores had been considerably augmented, and that these guns were more liberally supplied with German ammunition, the result of which was that our beaches were continuously shelled, especially from the Asiatic shore.

I gave it as my opinion that in my judgment I did not regard a feint as an operation offering any prospect of success. Time, the uncertainty of weather conditions in the *Ægean*, the absence of a suitable locality, and the withdrawal of small craft from the main issue for such an

operation were some of the reasons which influenced me in the decision at which I arrived. With the concurrence of the Vice-Admiral, therefore, it was decided the Navy should do their utmost to pursue a course of retaliation against the Turkish Batteries, but to refrain from any unusually aggressive attitude should the Turkish guns remain quiescent.

General Sir W. Birdwood had, in anticipation of being ordered to evacuate Helles, made such complete and far-seeing arrangements that he was able to proceed without delay to the issue of the comprehensive orders which the consummation of such a delicate operation in war requires.

He primarily arranged with General Brulard, who commanded the French Forces on the Peninsula, that in order to escape the disadvantages of divided command in the final stage, the French Infantry should be relieved as early as possible, but that their artillery should pass under the orders of the General Officer Commanding 8th Corps, and be withdrawn concurrently with the British guns at the opportune moment.

On the 30th December, in consequence of the instructions I had received from the Chief of the General Staff to hand over my command at Alexandria to Lieut.-General Sir A. Murray, who, it was stated, was to leave England on the 28th December, I broke up my Headquarters at Mudros and proceeded with a small staff, comprising representatives of the General Staff, the Quartermaster-General, and Adjutant-General branches, on H.M.S. *Cornwallis* to Alexandria. The rest of the Staff were sent on in front so as to have offices in working order when my successor should arrive.

In the meantime the evacuation, following the same system as was practised at Suvla and Anzac, proceeded without delay. The French Infantry remaining on the Peninsula were relieved on the night of the 1st-2nd January, and were embarked by the French Navy on the following nights. Progress, however, was slower than had been hoped, owing to delays caused by accident and the weather. One of our largest horse ships was sunk by a French battleship, whereby the withdrawal was considerably retarded, and at the same time strong winds sprang up which interfered materially with work on the beaches. The character of the weather now setting in offered so little hope of a calm period of any duration that General Sir W. Birdwood arranged with Admiral Sir J. de Robeck for the assistance of some destroyers in order to accelerate the progress of re-embarkation. They then determined to fix the final stage of the evacuation for the 8th January, or for the first fine night after that date.

Meanwhile the 8th Corps had maintained the offensive spirit in bombing and minor operations with which they had established the moral superiority they enjoyed over the enemy. On the 29th December the 52nd Division completed the excellent work which they had been carrying out for so long by capturing a considerable portion of the Turkish trenches, and by successfully holding these in the face of repeated counter-attacks. The shelling of our trenches and beaches, however, increased in frequency and intensity, and the average daily casualties continued to increase.

The method of evacuation adopted by Lieut.-General Sir F. J. Davies, K.C.B., Commanding 8th Corps, followed in general outline that which had proved successful in the Northern Zone. As the removal of the whole of the heavy guns capable of replying to the enemy's artillery would have indicated our intentions to the enemy, it was decided to retain, but eventually destroy, one 6-inch British gun and six French heavy guns of old pattern which it would be impossible to remove on the last night. General Brulard himself suggested the destruction of these French guns.

The first step taken as regards the withdrawal of the troops was the formation of a strong Embarkation Staff and the preparation of positions covering the landings, in which small garrisons could maintain themselves against attack for a short time should the enemy become aware of our intention and follow up the movement.

Major-General the Hon. H. A. Lawrence, Commanding the 52nd Division, was selected to take charge of all embarkation operations. At the same time the services of various Staff officers were placed at the disposal of the General Officer Commanding 8th Corps, and they rendered very valuable assistance.

The General Officer Commanding 13th Division selected and prepared a position covering Gully Beach. Other lines were selected and entrenched, covering the remainder of the beaches from the sea north of Sedd-el-Bahr to "X" Beach inclusive. Garrisons were detailed for these defences, those at Gully Beach being under the General Officer Commanding 13th Division, and those covering the remainder of the beaches being placed under the command of a selected officer, whose headquarters were established at an early date, together with those of the General Officer Commanding Embarkation, at Corps Headquarters.

As the withdrawing troops passed within the line of these defences they came under the orders of the General Officer Commanding Embarkation, which were conveyed to them by his Staff Officers at each beach.

In addition to these beach defences four lines of defence were arranged, three being already in existence and strongly wired. The fourth was a line of posts extending from De Tott's Battery on the east to the position covering Gully Beach on the west.

The time fixed for the last parties to leave the front trenches was 11.45 P.M., in order to permit the majority of the troops being already embarked before the front line was vacated. It was calculated that it would take between two and three hours for them to reach the beaches, at the conclusion of which time the craft to embark them would be ready.

The Naval arrangements for embarkation were placed in the hands of Captain C. M. Staveley, R.N., assisted by a staff of Naval officers at each place of embarkation.

On the 7th January, the enemy developed heavy artillery fire on the trenches held by the 13th Division, while the Asiatic guns shelled those occupied by the Royal Naval Division. The bombardment, which was reported to be the heaviest experienced since we landed in April, lasted from noon until 5 P.M., and was intensive between 3 P.M. and

3.30. Considerable damage was done to our parapets and communication trenches, and telephone communications were interrupted. At 3.30 P.M. two Turkish mines were sprung near Fusilier Bluff, and the Turkish trenches were seen to be full of men whom their officers appeared to be urging to the assault. No attack, however, was developed except against Fusilier Bluff, where a half-hearted assault was quickly repulsed. Our shortage of artillery at this time was amply compensated for by the support received from fire of the supporting squadron under Captain D. L. Dent, R.N. Our casualties amounted to 2 officers and 56 other ranks killed, and 4 officers and 102 other ranks wounded.

The 8th January was a bright, calm day, with a light breeze from the south. There was every indication of the continuance of favourable conditions, and in the opinion of the Meteorological Officer, no important change was to be expected for at least 24 hours. The Turkish artillery were unusually inactive. All preparations for the execution of the final stage were complete.

The embarkation was fixed at such an hour that the troops detailed for the first trip might be able to leave their positions after dark. The second trip was timed so that at least a greater portion of the troops for this trip would, if all went well, be embarked before the final parties had left the front trenches. The numbers to be embarked at the first trip were fixed by the maximum that could be carried by the craft available, those of the second trip being reduced in order to provide for the possibility of casualties occurring amongst the craft required to carry them.

The numbers for the third trip consisted only of the parties left to hold front trenches to the last, together with the garrisons of the beach defences, the Naval and Military beach personnel, and such R.E. personnel as might be required to effect the necessary repairs to any piers or harbour works that might be damaged.

About 7 P.M. the breeze freshened considerably from the south-west, the most unfavourable quarter, but the first trip, timed for 8 P.M., was dispatched without difficulty. The wind, however, continued to rise until, by 11 P.M., the connecting pier between the hulks and the shore at "W" Beach was washed away by heavy seas, and further embarkation into destroyers from these hulks became impracticable. In spite of these difficulties the second trips, which commenced at 11.30 P.M., were carried out well up to time, and the embarkation of guns continued uninterruptedly. Early in the evening reports had been received from the right flank that a hostile submarine was believed to be moving down the Straits, and about midnight H.M.S. *Prince George*, which had embarked 2,000 men, and was sailing for Mudros, reported she was struck by a torpedo which failed to explode. The indications of the presence of a submarine added considerably to the anxiety for the safety of the troop carriers, and made it necessary for the Vice-Admiral to modify the arrangements made for the subsequent bombardment of the evacuated positions.

At 1.50 A.M. Gully Beach reported that the embarkation at that beach was complete, and that the lighters were about to push off, but

at 2.10 A.M. a telephone message was received that one of the lighters was aground and could not be refloated. The N.T.O. at once took all possible steps to have another lighter sent in to Gully Beach, and this was, as a matter of fact, done within an hour, but in the meantime, at 2.30 A.M., it was decided to move the 160 men, who had been relanded from the grounded lighter, to "W" Beach and embark them there.

From 2.40 A.M. the steadily increasing swell caused the N.T.O. the greatest anxiety as to the possibility of embarking the remainder of the troops if their arrival was much deferred.

At 3.30 A.M. the evacuation was complete, and abandoned heaps of stores and supplies were successfully set on fire by time fuses after the last man had embarked. Two magazines of ammunition and explosives were also successfully blown up at 4 A.M. These conflagrations were apparently the first intimation received by the Turks that we had withdrawn. Red lights were immediately discharged from the enemy's trenches, and heavy artillery fire opened on our trenches and beaches. This shelling was maintained until about 6.30 A.M.

Apart from four unserviceable 15-pounders, which had been destroyed earlier in the month, 10 worn-out 15-pounders, one 6-inch Mark VII. gun, and six old heavy French guns, all of which were previously blown up, were left on the Peninsula. In addition to the above, 508 animals, most of which were destroyed, and a number of vehicles and considerable quantities of stores, material, and supplies, all of which were destroyed by burning, had to be abandoned.

It would have been possible, of course, by extending the period during which the process of evacuation proceeded to have reduced the quantity of stores and material that was left behind on the Peninsula, but not to the degree that may seem apparent at first sight. Our chances of enjoying a continuity of fine weather in the *Ægean* were very slender in the month of January; it was indeed a contingency that had to be reckoned with that we might very probably be visited by a spell of bad weather which would cut us off completely from the Peninsula for a fortnight or perhaps for even longer.

Supplies, ammunition, and material to a certain degree had therefore to be left to the last moment for fear of the isolation of the garrison at any moment when the evacuation might be in progress. I decided therefore that our aim should be primarily the withdrawal of the bulk of the personnel, artillery, and ammunition in the intermediate period, and that no risks should be taken in prolonging the withdrawal of personnel at the final stage with a view to reducing the quantity of stores left.

The entire evacuation of the Peninsula had now been completed. It demanded for its successful realisation two important military essentials—viz., good luck and skilled disciplined organisation—and they were both forthcoming to a marked degree at the hour needed. Our luck was in the ascendant by the marvellous spell of calm weather which prevailed. But we were able to turn to the fullest advantage these accidents of fortune.

Lieut.-General Sir W. Birdwood and his Corps Commanders elaborated and prepared the orders in reference to the evacuation with

a skill, competence, and courage which could not have been surpassed and we had a further stroke of good fortune in being associated with Vice-Admiral Sir J. de Robeck, K.C.B., Vice-Admiral Wemyss, and a body of Naval officers whose work remained throughout this anxious period at that standard of accuracy and professional ability which is beyond the power of criticism or cavil.

The Line of Communication Staff, both Naval and Military, represented respectively by Lieut.-General E. A. Altham, C.B., C.M.G., Commodore M.S. FitzMaurice, R.N., Principal Naval Transport Officer, and Captain H. V. Simpson, R.N., Superintending Transport Officer, contributed to the success of the operation by their untiring zeal and conspicuous ability.

The members of the Headquarters Staff showed themselves, without exception, to be officers with whom it was a privilege to be associated; their competence, zeal, and devotion to duty were uniform and unbroken. Amongst such a highly trained body of officers it is difficult to select and discriminate. I confine myself, therefore, to placing on record the fine services rendered by—

Colonel (temporary Major-General) Arthur Lynden Lynden-Bell, C.B., C.M.G., Chief of General Staff, G.H.Q.;

Colonel (temporary Major-General) Walter Campbell, C.B., D.S.O., Deputy-Quartermaster-General, G.H.Q., M.E.F.;

Lieutenant-Colonel (temporary Brigadier-General) W. Gillman, C.M.G., D.S.O., Brigadier-General, General Staff;

Brevet Major (temporary Lieutenant-Colonel) G. P. Dawnay, D.S.O., M.V.O., General Staff;

and whilst bringing to notice the names of these officers to whom I am so much indebted, I trust I may be permitted to represent the loyal, cordial, and unswerving assistance rendered by General J. M. J. A. Brulard, Commanding the French Troops in the Peninsula.

Before concluding this inadequate account of the events which happened during my tenure of command of the Forces in the Eastern Mediterranean, I desire to give a brief explanation of the work which was carried out on the Line of Communications, and to place on record my appreciation of the admirable work rendered by the officers responsible for this important service.

On the Dardanelles Peninsula it may be said that the whole of the machinery by which the text-books contemplate the maintenance and supply of an army was non-existent. The zone commanded by the enemy's guns extended not only to the landing places on the Peninsula, but even over the sea in the vicinity.

The beaches were the advanced dépôts and refilling points at which the services of supply had to be carried out under artillery fire. The landing of stores as well as of troops was only possible under cover of darkness.

The sea, the ships, lighters, and tugs took, in fact, the place of railways and roads, with their railway trains, mechanical transport, etc., but with this difference, that the use of the latter is subject only to the intervention of the enemy, while that of the former was dependent on the weather.

Between the beaches and the Base at Alexandria, 800 miles to the south, the Line of Communications had but two harbours, Kephalos Bay, on the Island of Imbros, 15 miles roughly from the beaches, and Mudros Bay at a distance of 60 miles. In neither were there any piers, breakwaters, wharves, or storehouses of any description before the advent of the troops. On the shores of these two bays there were no roads of any military value, or buildings fit for military usage. The water supply at these islands was, until developed, totally inadequate for our needs.

The Peninsula landing places were open beaches. Kephalos Bay is without protection from the north, and swept by a high sea in northerly gales. In Mudros Harbour trans-shipments and disembarkations were often seriously impeded with a wind from the north and south. These difficulties were accentuated by the advent of submarines in the *Ægean* Sea, on account of which the Vice-Admiral deemed it necessary to prohibit any transport or store ship exceeding 1,500 tons proceeding north of Mudros, and although this rule was relaxed in the case of supply ships proceeding within the netted area of Suvla, it necessitated the trans-shipment of practically all reinforcements, stores, and supplies—other than those for Suvla—into small ships in Mudros Harbour.

At Suvla and Anzac disembarkation could only be effected by lighters and tugs, thus for all personnel and material there was at least one trans-shipment, and for the greater portion of both two trans-shipments.

Yet notwithstanding the difficulties which have been set forth above, the Army was well maintained in equipment and ammunition. It was well fed, it received its full supply of winter clothing at the beginning of December. The evacuation of the sick and wounded was carried out with the minimum of inconvenience, and the provision of hospital accommodation for them on the Dardanelles Line of Communication and elsewhere in the Mediterranean met all requirements.

The above is a very brief exposition of the extreme difficulties with which the officers responsible were confronted in dealing with a problem of peculiar complexity. They were fortunate in being associated in their onerous and anxious task with a most competent and highly trained Naval Staff. The members of the two Staffs worked throughout in perfect harmony and cordiality, and it was owing to their joint efforts that the requirements of the troops were so well responded to.

TEXT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS
OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF GERMANY, AS REGARDS
THE SINKING OF THE *SUSSEX* AND GERMAN METHODS OF
SUBMARINE WARFARE.

I. PRESIDENT WILSON TO THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT. (PUBLISHED
APRIL 25.)

YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

I have not failed to communicate without delay, telegraphically, to my Government your Excellency's Note of the 10th inst., con-

cerning certain attacks of German submarines, and especially concerning the disastrous explosion which destroyed the French steamer *Sussex* on March 24 in the English Channel. In accordance with the instructions of my Government, I now have the honour to communicate to your Excellency the following answer:—

Through advices now in possession of the United States Government the facts in the *Sussex* case are completely established, and for the conclusions which my Government has deduced from these advices it finds confirmation in the circumstances set forth in your Excellency's Note of the 10th inst. On March 24, 1916, at about 2.50 in the afternoon, the unarmed steamer *Sussex*, with 325 or more passengers aboard, among whom were a number of American citizens, was torpedoed during her passage from Folkestone to Dieppe. The *Sussex* was never armed; she was a ship which, as is well known, was regularly employed only for the transport of passengers across the English Channel. She did not follow the route pursued by troop transports or munition ships. About eighty passengers, non-combatants of every age and both sexes, including citizens of the United States, were killed or wounded.

A careful, thorough, scientific, impartial examination by officers of the United States Navy and Army has conclusively established the fact that the *Sussex* was torpedoed without warning or challenge to surrender, and that the torpedo with which she was struck was of German make. In the view of the United States Government these facts, from beginning to end, made the conclusion that the torpedo was discharged from a German submarine inevitable. It now finds this conclusion fortified by the expositions in your Excellency's Note. A complete representation of the facts is appended on which the United States Government has based its conclusion. After careful examination of the Note of the Imperial Government of April 10 the United States Government regrets to have to say that it has derived the impression from the representations and proposals of this Note, that the Imperial Government has failed to appreciate the seriousness of the situation which has arisen, not only out of the attack on the *Sussex*, but out of the whole method and character of submarine warfare as they appear in consequence of the unrestricted maintenance of the practice of indiscriminate destruction of merchantmen of every kind, nationality, and designation during a period exceeding twelve months by commanders of German submarines.

If the sinking of the *Sussex* had been an isolated case, that would enable the Government of the United States to hope that the officer responsible for the deed arbitrarily exceeded his instructions, or in criminal negligence failed to observe the prescribed measures of precaution, and that satisfaction might be done to justice by his appropriate punishment, associated with a formal disavowal of his conduct and the payment of appropriate compensation by the Imperial Government; but although the attack on the *Sussex* was evidently indefensible and caused so tragic a loss of human life that it appears as one of the most terrible examples of the inhumanity of the submarine warfare as waged by the commanders of German vessels, it unhappily stands not alone.

On the contrary, the Government of the United States is compelled by the most recent events to conclude that it is only one instance, although one of the gravest and most disturbing, of the deliberate method and spirit with which merchantmen of every kind, nationality, and designation are indiscriminately destroyed, and which has become the more unmistakable the more the activity of German submarines has increased in intensity and extension in recent months.

The Imperial Government will remember that when it announced in February, 1915, its intention to treat the waters of Great Britain and Ireland as a war area and destroy all merchantmen in enemy possession found within this danger zone, and when it warned all ships, both of neutrals and belligerents, to avoid the waters thus proscribed or enter them at their own peril, the Government of the United States protested earnestly. It assumed the standpoint that such a policy could not be followed without permanent, serious, and evident violations of recognised international law, especially if submarines should be employed as its instruments, because the rules of international law, rules resting on the principles of humanity and established for the protection of the life of non-combatants at sea, could not, in the nature of things be observed by such vessels. It based its protest on the fact that persons of neutral nationality and ships of neutral owners would be exposed to the most extreme and intolerable dangers, and that, under the then existing circumstances, the Imperial Government could establish no justifiable claim to close a part of the high seas.

The international law, which here applies and upon which the United States Government based its protest, is not of recent origin or based on purely arbitrary principles established by agreement. On the contrary, it rests on obvious principles of humanity and has long been in force, with the approval and the express assent of all civilised nations. The Imperial Government insisted, notwithstanding, on prosecuting the policy announced, while it expressed the hope that the existing dangers, at least for neutral ships, would be restricted to a minimum by instructions given to the commanders of its submarines, and assured the United States Government that it would apply every possible precaution to respect the rights of neutrals and protect the lives of non-combatants.

In pursuit of this policy of submarine warfare against its enemy's trade, so announced and begun despite the solemn protest of the United States Government, the Imperial Government's submarine commanders have practised a procedure of such reckless destruction as made it more and more clear during recent months that the Imperial Government has found no way to impose upon them such restrictions as it had hoped and promised. The Imperial Government has repeatedly and solemnly assured the United States Government that passenger ships, at least, would not be thus treated, and yet it has repeatedly allowed its submarine commanders to disregard these assurances with impunity. Even in February of this year it announced that it regarded armed merchantmen in enemy possession as part of the armed naval forces of its adversaries and would treat them as warships, while it bound itself, at least implicitly, to warn unarmed vessels and guarantee the lives of their

passengers and crews, but the submarine commanders have freely disregarded even this restriction.

Neutral ships, even neutral ships *en route* from neutral port to neutral port, have been destroyed, just as hostile ships, in steadily increasing number. Attacked merchantmen have sometimes been warned and challenged to surrender before being fired on or torpedoed, sometimes the most scanty security has been granted to their passengers and crews of being allowed to enter boats before the ship was sunk, but repeatedly no warning has been given, and not even refuge in boats was granted to passengers on board. Great ships like the *Lusitania* and the *Arabic*, and pure passenger ships like the *Sussex*, have been attacked without any warning, often before they were aware they were in the presence of an armed enemy ship, and the life of non-combatants, passengers, and crews was indiscriminately destroyed in a manner which the Government of the United States could only regard as wanton and lacking every justification. Indeed, no sort of limit was set to the further indiscriminate destruction of merchantmen of every kind and nationality outside the waters which the Imperial Government has been pleased to indicate as within the war zone. The list of Americans who lost their lives on the vessels thus attacked and destroyed has increased month by month until the terrible number of the victims has risen to hundreds.

The United States Government has adopted a very patient attitude, and at every stage of this painful experience of tragedy upon tragedy has striven to be guided by well-considered regard for the extraordinary circumstances of an unexampled war and to allow itself to be directed by feelings of sincerest friendship for the people and Government of Germany. It has accepted the successive explanations and assurances of the Imperial Government as naturally made in full sincerity and good faith, and has desired not to abandon the hope that it would be possible for the Imperial Government to regulate and supervise the actions of the commanders of its naval forces in a way which will bring their conduct into consonance with the recognised principles of humanity embodied in International Law. It has made every concession to the new circumstances for which no precedents exist, and was willing to wait till the facts were unmistakable and susceptible of only one explanation. It owes it now to the just appreciation of its own rights to declare to the Imperial Government that this moment has arrived.

To its pain, it has become clear to it that the standpoint which it adopted from the beginning is inevitably right—namely, that the employment of submarines for the destruction of enemy trade is of necessity, owing to the character of the ships employed and the methods of attack which their use involves, completely irreconcilable with the principles of humanity, with the long existing, undisputed rights of neutrals, and with the sacred privileges of non-combatants. If it is still the intention of the Imperial Government to wage further war mercilessly and indiscriminately with submarines against merchantmen without respect for what the Government of the United States must regard as the sacred and indisputable rules of International Law, and the generally recognised dictates of humanity, the United States

Government will be finally forced to the conclusion that there is only one course it can take. If the Imperial Government should not now, without delay, proclaim and make effective renunciation of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and cargo ships, the United States Government can have no other choice than to break off completely diplomatic relations with the German Government.

The United States Government views such a step with the greatest reluctance, but it feels itself compelled to adopt it in the name of humanity and of the rights of neutral nations.

I seize this opportunity to renew to your Excellency the assurance of my most distinguished esteem.

(Signed) GERARD.

Evidence in the "Sussex" Case.

Appended to the American Note is a long document signed by Mr. Lansing, and containing the evidence with regard to the sinking of the *Sussex*. To every statement is added a reference showing the source of information.

The document first sets out the date and time at which the *Sussex* left England; the fact that there were about twenty-five American citizens among the passengers, who included many women and children; the fact that the *Sussex* was unarmed; the fact that the *Sussex* was never used as a transport; the course that she took; the sighting of a torpedo; the circumstances in which the ship was struck; and the fact that no other ship was in sight at the time. The fact that a torpedo was seen before the ship was struck is supported by sworn evidence of the captain's order to port the helm and of the carrying out of the order.

The evidence is then adduced of Captain Smith, of the United States Navy, and of Major Logan, of the American Embassy, who examined the *Sussex* and themselves discovered and retained fifteen pieces of metal. The American officers gave technical reasons for the belief that the *Sussex* was torpedoed, and expressed "the firm opinion that the pieces of metal were not parts of a mine." Among them were two screw-bolts which showed the effects of an explosion, one of them being marked "K 56" and the other "K 58." German torpedoes in the possession of the naval authorities at Toulon and at Portsmouth proved the use of identical screws bearing the letter "K" and a number. The American officers were also able "positively to identify all the other thirteen pieces of metal as parts of a German torpedo."

The statement declares that in view of these proved facts there can be "no reasonable doubt" that the *Sussex* was torpedoed by a German torpedo, and says that the conclusion is "imperative" that the torpedo was fired without warning by a submerged submarine which remained under water after the explosion. The statement ends with a description of the whole event as reconstructed from the evidence.

II. REPLY OF THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT AS ISSUED BY THE WIRELESS PRESS. (PUBLISHED MAY 6.)

The German Government has handed over to the proper naval authorities for further investigation the evidence concerning the *Sussex*

as communicated by the United States Government. Judging by the results which that investigation has hitherto yielded, the German Government is alive to the possibility that the ship mentioned in the Note of April 10 as torpedoed by a German submarine is actually identical with the *Sussex*.

The German Government begs to reserve further communications on the matter until certain points which are of decisive importance for establishing the facts of the case have been ascertained. Should it turn out that the commander of the submarine was wrong in assuming the vessel to be a man-of-war, the German Government will not fail to draw (? accept) the consequences resulting therefrom.

In connexion with the case of the *Sussex*, the United States Government made a series of statements, the gist of which is the assertion that the incident is to be considered but one instance of a deliberate method of indiscriminate destruction of vessels of all sorts, of all nationalities, and of all destinations by German submarine commanders. The German Government must emphatically repudiate this assertion, and thinks it of little avail to enter into details in the present stage of affairs, more particularly as the Government of the United States omitted to substantiate the assertion by reference to concrete facts. The German Government will only state that it has as far as possible instituted a far-reaching restraint upon the use of the submarine weapon solely in consideration of neutrals' interests, in spite of the fact that these restrictions were necessarily of advantage to Germany's enemies. No such consideration has ever been shown to neutrals by Great Britain and her Allies.

The German submarine forces have had in fact orders to conduct submarine warfare in accordance with the general principles of search and destruction of merchant vessels recognised by International Law, the sole exception being the conduct of warfare against enemy trade carried on by enemy freight-ships encountered in the war zone surrounding Great Britain. With regard to these, no assurances have ever been given to the Government of the United States. No such assurance was contained in the declaration of February 8, 1916.

[This was the declaration in which Germany announced her intention to treat all armed merchantmen as belligerent ships. The American Note about the *Sussex* claimed that in this declaration Germany had bound herself, "at least implicitly, to warn unarmed vessels, and guarantee the lives of their passengers and crews."]

The German Government cannot admit any doubt that these orders were given and executed in good faith. Errors actually occurred. In no kind of warfare can they be avoided altogether. Allowances must be made in the conduct of naval warfare against an enemy resorting to all kinds of ruses whether permissible or illicit. But, apart from the possibility of errors, naval warfare, just like warfare on land, implies unavoidable dangers for neutral persons and goods entering the fighting zone. Even in cases where naval actions are confined to ordinary forms of cruiser warfare, neutral persons and goods repeatedly come to grief. The German Government has repeatedly and explicitly pointed out the dangers from mines that have led to the loss of numerous ships.

The German Government made several proposals to the United States Government in order to reduce to a minimum for American travellers and goods the inherent dangers of naval warfare. Unfortunately the Government of the United States decided not to accept the proposals. Had it accepted them the Government of the United States would have been instrumental in preventing a greater part of the accidents that American citizens have met with in the meantime. The German Government still stands by its offer to come to an agreement along these lines.

[The offer was a proposal that a reasonable number of neutral ships, under the American flag, should be used for carrying passengers, and that these, if conspicuously marked, and if reasonable notice of their departures were given to Germany, would be respected.]

As the German Government has repeatedly declared, it cannot dispense with the use of the submarine weapon in the conduct of warfare against enemy trade. The German Government, however, has now decided to make a further concession, adapting the methods of submarine warfare to the interests of neutrals. In reaching this decision the German Government is actuated by considerations which are above the level of disputed question.

The German Government attaches no less importance to the sacred principles of humanity than the Government of the United States. Again it fully takes into account the fact that both Governments for many years co-operated in developing International Law in conformity with these principles, the ultimate object of which has always been to confine warfare on sea and land to the armed forces of the belligerents, and to safeguard as far as possible non-combatants against the horrors of war.

But, although these considerations are of great weight, they alone would not, in the present circumstances, have determined the attitude of the German Government; for in answer to the appeal by the Government of the United States on behalf of the sacred principles of humanity and International Law, the German Government must repeat once more with all emphasis that it was not the German but the British Government which, ignoring all accepted rules of International Law, extended this terrible war to the lives and property of non-combatants, having no regard whatever for the interests and rights of neutrals and non-combatants that through this method of warfare have been severely injured. In self-defence against the illegal conduct of British warfare, while fighting a bitter struggle for national existence, Germany had to resort to the hard but effective weapon of submarine warfare.

As matters stand the German Government cannot but reiterate its regret that sentiments of humanity, which the Government of the United States extends with such fervour to the unhappy victims of submarine warfare, have not been extended with the same feeling to the many millions of women and children, who, according to the avowed intention of the British Government, are to be starved, and who by sufferings are to force the victorious armies of the Central Powers into an ignominious capitulation. The German Government in agreement with the German people fails to understand this discrimination, all the more as it has repeatedly and explicitly declared itself ready to use the submarine

weapon in strict conformity with the rules of International Law as recognised before the outbreak of war, if Great Britain is likewise ready to adapt her conduct of warfare to these rules.

The several attempts which have been made by the Government of the United States to prevail upon the British Government to act accordingly failed because of the flat refusal on the part of the British Government. Moreover, Great Britain ever since has again and again violated International Law surpassing all bounds and outraging neutral rights. The latest measure adopted by Great Britain of declaring German bunker coal contraband and of establishing conditions under which alone English bunker coal can be supplied to neutrals is nothing but an unheard of attempt by way of exaction to force neutral tonnage into the service of the British trade war.

The German people knows that the Government of the United States has the power to confine war to the armed forces of belligerent countries in the interests of humanity and the maintenance of International Law. The Government of the United States would have been certain of attaining that end had it been determined to insist, against Great Britain, on incontestable rights to the freedom of the seas. But, as matters stand, the German people is under the impression that the Government of the United States while demanding that Germany, who is struggling for her existence, shall restrain the use of her effective weapon, and while making compliance with these demands the condition for the maintenance of relations with Germany, confines itself to protests against the illegal methods adopted by Germany's enemies. Moreover, the German people knows to what considerable extent her enemies are supplied with all kinds of war materials from the United States.

It will, therefore, be understood that the appeal made by the Government of the United States to the sentiment of humanity and the principles of International Law, cannot under the circumstances meet with the same hearty response from the German people which such an appeal would otherwise always be certain to find here. If the German Government nevertheless resolved to go the limit of the concessions (? demanded) it is not alone being guided by the friendship connecting two great nations for over a hundred years, but also by the thought of the great doom which threatens the entire civilised world, should this cruel and sanguinary war be extended and prolonged.

The German Government is conscious of Germany's strength. Twice within the past few months she has announced before the world her readiness to make peace on a basis safeguarding Germany's vital interests, thus indicating that it is not Germany's fault if peace is still withheld from the nations of Europe. The German Government feels all the more justified in declaring that the responsibility could not be borne before the forum of mankind and history if after 21 months' duration of war the submarine question under discussion between the German Government and the Government of the United States were to take a turn seriously threatening the maintenance of peace between these two nations.

As far as lies with the German Government it wishes to prevent

things from taking such a course. The German Government, moreover, is prepared to do its utmost to confine the operations of war for the rest of its duration to the fighting forces of the belligerents, thereby also ensuring the freedom of the seas, a principle upon which the German Government believes itself to be now, as before, in agreement with the Government of the United States.

The German Government, guarded (? guided) by this idea, notifies the Government of the United States that the German naval forces receive the following orders for submarine warfare in accordance with the general principles of visit, search, and destruction of merchant vessels recognised by International Law. Such vessels both within and without the area declared as a naval war zone shall not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives unless the ship attempts to escape or offer resistance.

But neutral vessels cannot expect that Germany, forced to fight for her existence, shall for the sake of neutral interests restrict the use of her effective weapon if the enemy is permitted to continue to apply at will methods of warfare violating the rules of International Law. Such a demand would be incompatible with the character of neutrality, and the German Government is convinced that the Government of the United States does not think of making such a demand knowing that the Government of the United States repeatedly declared that it is determined to restore the principle of the freedom of the seas from whatever quarter it has been violated.

Accordingly, the German Government is confident that in consequence of the new orders issued to her naval forces the Government of the United States will now also consider all impediments removed which may have been in the way of mutual co-operation towards restoration of the freedom of the seas during the war as suggested in the Note of July 23, 1915, and it does not doubt that the Government of the United States will now demand and insist that the British Government shall forthwith observe the rules of International Law universally recognised before the war, as are laid down in the Notes presented by the Government of the United States to the British Government on December 28, 1914, and November 5, 1915.

[The Note of December 28, 1914, was a friendly remonstrance against our alleged improper interference with neutral trade. The Note of November 5, 1915, was a protest against our interference with commerce to Germany and adjacent countries based upon three main grounds: (1) That our reading of the law of contraband was wrong; (2) that our "blockade" instituted by the Order in Council of March 11, 1915, was illegal; and (3) that our suggestion that American shipping might protect itself through our Prize Courts was illusory.]

Should the steps taken by the Government of the United States not attain the object it desires, *viz.*, to have the laws of humanity followed by all belligerent nations, the German Government would then be facing a new situation in which it must reserve for itself a complete liberty of decision.

THE BRYCE REPORT.

The Report of the Committee appointed in December, 1915 [A.R., 1915] to consider and advise on the evidence as to outrages alleged to have been committed by German troops during the present war, was issued in May. The members of the Committee were:—

Lord Bryce (Chairman).
Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., K.C.
Sir Edward Clarke, K.C.
Sir Kenelm Digby, K.C., G.C.B.
Sir Alfred Hopkinson, K.C.
Mr. H. A. L. Fisher.
Mr. Harold Cox.

The evidence was collected mainly from Belgian refugees, wounded Belgian soldiers, and British officers and soldiers. The witnesses in many cases asked that their names might not be disclosed; and it was necessary to promise that their identity should not be divulged. The following is a summary of the Report:—

I. CONDUCT OF GERMANS IN BELGIUM.

LIÉGE AND DISTRICT.

From the very beginning of the operations the civilian population of the villages on the line of the German advance on Liège were made to experience the extreme horrors of war. A witness from Hervé (near the frontier) said:—

"On August 4, 1914, at Hervé I saw at about two o'clock in the afternoon, near the station, five Uhlans; these were the first German troops I had seen. They were followed by a German officer and some soldiers in a motor-car. The men in the car called out to a couple of young fellows who were standing about thirty yards away. The young men, being afraid, ran off, and then the Germans fired upon them and killed one of them."

Villages were burned and pillaged, civilians of both sexes shot indiscriminately, and batches of selected males executed under an organised system. Thus at Hervé fifty men escaping from burning houses were seized and shot outside the town; and at Melen forty men were shot. In one household

"The father and mother were shot, and a daughter of 22, having been outraged, died because of the violence she had received. A son was wounded by several shots."

"Near Vottem [says a soldier] we were pursuing some Uhlans. I saw a man, woman, and a girl about 9, who had been killed. They were on the threshold of a house, one on the top of the other."

Enraged by the losses which they had sustained through the resistance of Fort Fléron, suspicious of the temper of the civilian population, and probably thinking that by exceptional severities at the outset they could cow the spirit of the Belgian nation, the German officers and men speedily accustomed themselves to the slaughter of civilians. How rapidly the process was effected is illustrated by an entry in the diary

of Kurt Hoffman, who on August 5 was in front of Fort Fléron. "The position," he says, "was dangerous. As suspicious civilians were hanging about—houses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 were cleared, the owners arrested (and shot the following day)." Hoffman does not say of what offence these citizens were guilty. They were "suspicious," and that was enough.

In Soumagne and Micheroux very many civilians were summarily shot. A witness from Soumagne says:—

"I walked in the direction of my house, which was about 200 metres away. On the way I saw about twenty dead bodies. . . . One of them was that of a little girl aged 13. . . . I know of nothing having been done to annoy the Germans."

At Heure le Romain the burgomaster's brother and the priest were bayoneted. At Hervé soldiers shot into doors and windows of burning houses to prevent the escape of the inmates. Visé was completely destroyed. What happened is described by a man of some means:—

"I saw commissioned officers directing and supervising the burning. It was done systematically with the use of benzine spread on the floors and then lighted. In my own and another house, I saw officers before the burning come in with their revolvers in their hands, and have china, valuable antique furniture, and other such things removed. This being done, the houses were by their orders set on fire. On the morning of August 15 two officers inspected my house, and finding there were things worth taking, they wrote and signed a paper directing the house to be spared, and pinned it on the door. Then when the valuables had been removed the place was burnt down. I took the paper off the door and preserved it."

The original paper was produced to the Committee.

"On August 16[said another witness] the Germans took me prisoner at my house (at Flémalle Grande). . . . On my way home I met Mrs. —, a neighbour. She told me that some German soldiers had driven her daughter up into the loft to rape her. She was 8½ months gone in pregnancy. Two of them raped her. The child was born the following day."

An entry in a German diary shows that on August 19 the soldiers gave themselves up to debauchery at Liège, and next day there was a massacre in the streets. General Koleur said that the troops had been fired at by students; the diarist remarks:—"In the night the inhabitants became mutinous. Forty persons were shot, and fifteen houses demolished; ten soldiers shot. The sights there make you cry." The Belgian witnesses deny that there was any provocation; they say the affair was planned beforehand; one citizen was warned by a friendly German soldier not to go out that night. However this may be, houses were burned systematically with benzine, and the inmates were prevented by rifle-fire from escaping. The fire brigade was not allowed to extinguish the fires, and next day (August 21) there were numerous murders and outrages. A soldier describes the rape in open day of fifteen or twenty women in the Place de l'Université.

"While this was going on about seventy Germans were standing round the women, including five officers (young). The officers started it. . . . Many of the women fainted and showed no signs of life,"

THE BRYCE REPORT.

The Report of the Committee appointed in December, 1915 [A.R., 1915] to consider and advise on the evidence as to outrages alleged to have been committed by German troops during the present war, was issued in May. The members of the Committee were:—

Lord Bryce (Chairman).
Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., K.C.
Sir Edward Clarke, K.C.
Sir Kenelm Digby, K.C., G.C.B.
Sir Alfred Hopkinson, K.C.
Mr. H. A. L. Fisher.
Mr. Harold Cox.

The evidence was collected mainly from Belgian refugees, wounded Belgian soldiers, and British officers and soldiers. The witnesses in many cases asked that their names might not be disclosed; and it was necessary to promise that their identity should not be divulged. The following is a summary of the Report:—

I. CONDUCT OF GERMANS IN BELGIUM.

LIÉGE AND DISTRICT.

From the very beginning of the operations the civilian population of the villages on the line of the German advance on Liège were made to experience the extreme horrors of war. A witness from Hervé (near the frontier) said:—

“On August 4, 1914, at Hervé I saw at about two o’clock in the afternoon, near the station, five Uhlans; these were the first German troops I had seen. They were followed by a German officer and some soldiers in a motor-car. The men in the car called out to a couple of young fellows who were standing about thirty yards away. The young men, being afraid, ran off, and then the Germans fired upon them and killed one of them.”

Villages were burned and pillaged, civilians of both sexes shot indiscriminately, and batches of selected males executed under an organised system. Thus at Hervé fifty men escaping from burning houses were seized and shot outside the town; and at Melen forty men were shot. In one household

“The father and mother were shot, and a daughter of 22, having been outraged, died because of the violence she had received. A son was wounded by several shots.”

“Near Vottem [says a soldier] we were pursuing some Uhlans. I saw a man, woman, and a girl about 9, who had been killed. They were on the threshold of a house, one on the top of the other.”

Enraged by the losses which they had sustained through the resistance of Fort Fléron, suspicious of the temper of the civilian population, and probably thinking that by exceptional severities at the outset they could cow the spirit of the Belgian nation, the German officers and men speedily accustomed themselves to the slaughter of civilians. How rapidly the process was effected is illustrated by an entry in the diary

of Kurt Hoffman, who on August 5 was in front of Fort Fléron. "The position," he says, "was dangerous. As suspicious civilians were hanging about—houses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 were cleared, the owners arrested (and shot the following day)." Hoffman does not say of what offence these citizens were guilty. They were "suspicious," and that was enough.

In Soumagne and Micheroux very many civilians were summarily shot. A witness from Soumagne says:—

"I walked in the direction of my house, which was about 200 metres away. On the way I saw about twenty dead bodies. . . . One of them was that of a little girl aged 13. . . . I know of nothing having been done to annoy the Germans."

At Heure le Romain the burgomaster's brother and the priest were bayoneted. At Hervé soldiers shot into doors and windows of burning houses to prevent the escape of the inmates. Visé was completely destroyed. What happened is described by a man of some means:—

"I saw commissioned officers directing and supervising the burning. It was done systematically with the use of benzine spread on the floors and then lighted. In my own and another house, I saw officers before the burning come in with their revolvers in their hands, and have china, valuable antique furniture, and other such things removed. This being done, the houses were by their orders set on fire. On the morning of August 15 two officers inspected my house, and finding there were things worth taking, they wrote and signed a paper directing the house to be spared, and pinned it on the door. Then when the valuables had been removed the place was burnt down. I took the paper off the door and preserved it."

The original paper was produced to the Committee.

"On August 16[said another witness] the Germans took me prisoner at my house (at Flémalle Grande). . . . On my way home I met Mrs. —, a neighbour. She told me that some German soldiers had driven her daughter up into the loft to rape her. She was 8½ months gone in pregnancy. Two of them raped her. The child was born the following day."

An entry in a German diary shows that on August 19 the soldiers gave themselves up to debauchery at Liège, and next day there was a massacre in the streets. General Kœler said that the troops had been fired at by students; the diarist remarks:—"In the night the inhabitants became mutinous. Forty persons were shot, and fifteen houses demolished; ten soldiers shot. The sights there make you cry." The Belgian witnesses deny that there was any provocation; they say the affair was planned beforehand; one citizen was warned by a friendly German soldier not to go out that night. However this may be, houses were burned systematically with benzine, and the inmates were prevented by rifle-fire from escaping. The fire brigade was not allowed to extinguish the fires, and next day (August 21) there were numerous murders and outrages. A soldier describes the rape in open day of fifteen or twenty women in the Place de l'Université.

"While this was going on about seventy Germans were standing round the women, including five officers (young). The officers started it. . . . Many of the women fainted and showed no signs of life."

Similar crimes were general throughout the district from the very beginning. The writer of one of the German diaries says :—

“We crossed the Belgian frontier on August 15, 1914, at 11.50 in the forenoon, and then we went steadily along the main road till we got into Belgium. Hardly were we there when we had a horrible sight. Houses were burnt down, the inhabitants chased away, and some of them shot. Not one of the hundreds of houses were spared. Everything was plundered and burnt. Hardly had we passed through this large village before the next village was burnt, and so it went on continuously.”

The town of Huy was seized on August 12; Namur was attacked on the 20th. On the same day there was a massacre at Andenne (a small town on the Meuse, opposite Seilles), which had been entered without opposition on the preceding day. The slaughter continued for over two hours and intermittently throughout the night. Machine-guns were used and the soldiers murdered and ravaged unchecked. Summarising the evidence of responsible witnesses, the Report says :—

“When the fire slackened about 7 o'clock, many of the townspeople fled in the direction of the quarries; others remained in their houses. At this moment the whole of the district round the station was on fire and houses were flaming over a distance of two kilometres in the direction of the hamlet of Tramaka. The little farms which rise one above the other on the high ground of the right bank were also burning. At 6 o'clock on the following morning, the 21st, the Germans began to drag the inhabitants from their houses. . . . About 400 people lost their lives in this massacre. . . . Eight men belonging to one family were murdered. Another man was placed close to a machine-gun, which was fired through him. His wife brought his body home on a wheelbarrow. The Germans broke into her house and ransacked it, and piled up all the eatables in a heap on the floor and relieved themselves upon it. . . . A few days later the Germans celebrated a *fête nocturne* in the square. Hot wine, looted in the town, was drunk, and the women were compelled to give three cheers for the Kaiser and to sing ‘Deutschland über alles.’”

There were frequent outrages in the country round Namur. A soldier at Marchoveletta saw Germans enter a farm in which there was a wounded man. They pushed him into a shed and put straw inside.

“The Germans set fire to the straw and the farm was soon on fire—the granary immediately. When the smoke began all the Germans came out. One of them was riding one of the farm-horses with one of the farmer's daughters in front of him. He had his left arm round her. She was crying and her hair was all down. I do not know what became of her. . . . The farmer and his family and the wounded men must have all been burnt.”

A professional man says that Namur was systematically set on fire in six different places. About 140 houses were burned altogether. Some days before the German entry the Belgian authorities had put up notices warning the population against giving any provocation to the Germans, and none of any kind was given. On the 25th the hospital at Namur was set on fire with inflammable pastiles.

At Tamines, on the Meuse, and in neighbouring places, many

aged people, women and children were deliberately murdered by the soldiers. A woman at Tamines saw a boy of fifteen shot on the village green, and a day or two later a little girl and her two brothers, who were looking at the soldiers, were killed before her eyes for no apparent reason. On August 23 a witness saw the public square at Tamines littered with corpses, and found those of his wife and child.

"The Germans [he says] compelled men of the town to help in digging a grave in the public square for the killed. The Christian Brothers and the curé of the Church of St. Martin had to help to dig. . . . My wife's body had a stab in the head and also one in the breast at the left side. My little girl had a stab in the neck. I also saw the body of the curé of the Church of Les Alloux. His ears and one arm were cut and nearly severed from the body."

At Morlanwelz the Hôtel de Ville and sixty-two houses were burned. At Monceau-sur-Sambre 312 houses were destroyed, and inhabitants were brutally ill-used. At Montigny-sur-Sambre incendiaries with a distinctive badge on their arms went down the main street with bags from which they threw handfuls of explosive pastiles into the houses. In the main street 130 houses were burned.

At Jumet a wounded girl who had hidden in an oven was fired at by a German soldier; she died next day. A witness at Charleroi "saw the Germans putting straw into the cellars of houses which had been burned the day before, but in the cellars of which there were still living people, and setting the straw on fire."

A woman tells how

"At Marchiennes au Pont on August 22 a young girl of 17 was killed by the Germans in a field behind the house in which she lived. I saw the body two days afterwards. . . . The body was quite naked, and the breast cut and covered with blood. . . . I was told that the girl, mistaking Germans for English, cried 'Vive l'Angleterre!' She was dragged from the house into this field, outraged and killed."

The shocking manner in which civilians at Dinant were treated is described by several of the townspeople. Dinant was systematically set on fire by hand grenades.

"We have no reason [say the Committee] to believe that the civil population of Dinant gave any provocation, or that any other defence can be put forward to justify the treatment inflicted upon its citizens."

The diary of a Saxon officer throws considerable light on the proceedings of the German Army in the country between Dinant and Rethel. Here are some extracts:—

Aug. 17.—"In the afternoon I had a look at the little château belonging to one of the King's secretaries (not at home). Our men had behaved like regular vandals. They had looted the cellar first, and then they had turned their attention to the bedrooms and thrown things about all over the place."

Aug. 23.—"Two 6-in. howitzers succeeded in getting into position, and in twenty shots reduced the village of Bouvines to ruins. . . . The men had already shown their brutal instincts; everything was upside down. The sight of the bodies of all the inhabitants who had been shot was indescribable. Every house in the whole village was destroyed.

We dragged the villagers one after another out of the most unlikely corners. The men were shot as well as the women and children who were in the convent, since shots had been fired from the convent windows; and we burnt it afterwards. The inhabitants might have escaped the penalty by handing over the guilty and paying 15,000f."

Aug. 26.—"We marched to Nismes. . . . The division took drastic steps to stop the villages being burnt and the inhabitants being shot. The pretty little village of Gue d'Ossus, however, was apparently set on fire without cause. . . . I hope there will be no more such horrors. At Leppe apparently 200 men were shot. There must have been some innocent men among them. In future we shall have to hold an inquiry as to their guilt instead of shooting them. . . ."

Sept. 3.—"Still at Rethel. . . . The vandals themselves could not have done more damage. This place is a disgrace to our army. . . . The column commanders are responsible for the greater part of the damage, as they could have prevented the looting and destruction. . . . I could not resist taking a little memento myself here and there."

The Aerschot, Malines, Vilvorde, and Louvain Quadrangle passed into the hands of the enemy on August 19, and "became from that date a scene of chronic outrage," with respect to which the Committee received a great mass of evidence. The arrival of the Germans was marked by systematic massacres and other outrages at Aerschot, Gelrode, and other villages. To quote the Report:—

"On August 25 the Belgians, sallying out of the defences of Antwerp, attacked the German positions at Malines, drove the enemy from the town and re-occupied many of the villages, such as Sempst, Hofstade, and Eppegheem in the neighbourhood. And just as numerous outrages against the civilian population had been the immediate consequence of the temporary repulse of the German vanguard from Fort Fléron, so a large body of depositions testify to the fact that a sudden outburst of cruelty was the response of the German Army to the Belgian victory at Malines."

The story of Aerschot is fairly well known, but the Committee's conclusions are of interest:—

"The German Army entered Aerschot [on August 19] quite early in the morning. Workmen going to their work were seized and taken as hostages. The Germans, apparently already irritated, proceeded to make a search for the priests and threatened to burn the convent if the priests should happen to be found there. . . . The Germans from the moment of their arrival in Aerschot were seeking to pick a quarrel with the inhabitants. . . . Throughout the day the town was looted by the soldiers. . . . A shot was fired about 7 o'clock in the evening, by which time many of the soldiers were drunk. The Germans were not of one mind as to the direction from which the shot proceeded. . . . No one was hit by this shot, but thereafter German soldiers began to fire in various directions at people in the streets.

"It is said that a German general or colonel was killed at the Burgomaster's house. As far as the Committee have been able to ascertain, the identity of the officer has never been revealed. The

German version of the story is that he was killed by the 15-year-old son of the Burgomaster; the Committee, however, is satisfied . . . that neither the Burgomaster nor his son were in the least degree responsible for the occurrence which served as the pretext for their subsequent execution, and for the firing and sack of the town.

"The houses were set on fire with special apparatus, while people were dragged from their houses already burning, and some were shot in the streets. . . . On the following day a number of the civilians were shot under the orders of an officer, together with the Burgomaster, his brother, and his son."

Some gross outrages were committed at Tremeloo and Westpelaer. A business man told the following story:—

"My wife's mother and my sister-in-law, who lived also in Werchter, went to my house to look after the cattle. . . . My house was burned and my sister and mother-in-law said that they went into a little place near the stable and while they were getting ready for a little meal four German soldiers arrived. . . . At midnight the four soldiers returned, and after two of them had searched the stable to see if any men were there, the four soldiers violated my mother-in-law and my sister-in-law. They held a revolver at the two women before violating them."

Immediately after the battle of Malines a long series of murders were committed either just before or during the retreat of the army. Many of the inhabitants, who were unarmed, including women and young children, were killed, and the evidence goes to show that the death of these villagers was due to deliberate purpose. The wounds were generally stabs or cuts, and for the most part appear to have been inflicted with the bayonet. The witness in Malines saw a German soldier cut a woman's breasts off after he had murdered her, and saw many other dead bodies of women in the streets. A married woman saw a drunken soldier drive his bayonet into the stomach of a child two years old, and carry it away on his bayonet, "he and his comrades still singing."

In Hofstade many corpses were seen, in houses and in the streets. A young man had had his wrists cut. A boy of five or six had had his hands nearly severed. Women and children had been bayoneted. A young woman had had her breasts cut off. Some were holding their hands together as if in the attitude of supplication. A girl complained that she had been violated by several soldiers for two hours, in full daylight and in view of villagers.

Other horrible tales were told of Weerde, Eppegheem, Elewyt, Vilvorde, Herent, Haecht, and Werchter. Here is one incident, described by a workman:—

"At Bueken (Brabant) I saw a priest ill-treated; he was an old man of 75 or 80 years of age. He was brought up with the other prisoners; he could not walk fast enough; he was driven on with blows from butt-ends of rifles and knocked down. . . . A soldier thrust his bayonet into his neck at the back. The old man begged to be shot, but the officer said, 'That's too good for you!' He was taken off behind a house and we heard shots. He did not return."

When the Belgian troops reached Werchter six persons were found dead in a house. The people there said that the family were shot because one of the girls would not give herself up to the Germans, and the family helped her. After reference to other outrages, the Committee say:—

“The catalogue of crimes does not by any means represent the sum total of the depositions relating to this district laid before the Committee. The above are given merely as examples of acts which the evidence shows to have taken place in numbers that might have seemed scarcely credible.”

The Belgian soldiers who recaptured Aerschot in September found the bodies of many murdered civilians ; some were in wells, some had been burnt alive in their houses. At Haecht the Belgians found a child of two or three nailed to the door of a farm by its hands and feet, and in the garden the body of a girl of five or six who had been shot in the forehead. This is a crime, say the Committee, “which seems almost incredible, but the evidence for which we feel bound to accept.” At Capelle-au-Bois two children were murdered in a cart, and their corpses were seen by many witnesses. At Eppeghem the body of a child of two was seen pinned to the ground with a German lance, and a mutilated woman, mad with pain, was met on the road near Weerde.

THE SACK OF LOUVAIN.

The Committee had before them a very valuable mass of evidence from witnesses of repute of what occurred in Louvain between August 19 and 25, and the Report gives the story in full. We here reproduce only a few incidents.

For six days the Germans were in peaceful occupation of the city. Except for some looting, discipline was effectively maintained.

On the evening of August 25 a sudden change takes place. The Germans, on that day repulsed by the Belgians, had retreated to and reoccupied Louvain. Immediately the devastation of that city commenced.

“The inference is irresistible that the army as a whole wreaked its vengeance on the civil population and the buildings of the city in revenge for the set-back which the Belgian arms had inflicted on them. A subsidiary cause alleged was the assertion, often made before, that civilians had fired upon the German Army. The depositions which relate to Louvain are numerous, and are believed by the Committee to present a true and fairly complete picture of the events of August 25 and 26 and subsequent days. We find no grounds for thinking that the inhabitants fired upon the German Army on the evening of August 25. Eye-witnesses worthy of credence detail exactly when, where and how the firing commenced. Such firing was by Germans on Germans. No impartial tribunal could, in our opinion, come to any other conclusion.”

On the evening of the 25th firing could be heard in the direction of Herent, some three kilometres from Louvain. An alarm was sounded in the city. Then the corps of incendiaries got to work. They had broad belts with the words “Gott mit uns,” and their equipment consisted of a hatchet, a syringe, a small shovel, and a revolver.

On the 26th, in the city of Louvain, massacre, fire, and destruction went on. The University, the church of St. Peter, and many houses were burnt to the ground. Citizens were shot and others taken prisoners. A workman "saw one woman lying in the street who had been cut in two with a bayonet. . . . I saw another soldier dragging a woman along the street by the hair. I also saw a soldier carrying a man's head on the end of his bayonet." An educated woman describes the mutilation of a little girl six years old. Many of the people hid in cellars, but the soldiers shot down through the gratings.

On the 27th orders were given that every one should leave the city, which was to be razed to the ground. Next day, the 28th, prisoners were placed in a large building on the cavalry exercising ground. "One woman went mad, some children died, others were born." On the 29th the prisoners were marched along the Malines Road. Of the corpses seen on the road some had their hands tied behind their backs, others were burnt, some had been killed by blows, and some corpses were those of children who had been shot. A witness, of good means, was arrested at noon by soldiers of the 165th Regiment, grossly ill-treated, and robbed by an officer of his purse and keys. He was then taken to the church in Rotselaer, where there were about 1,500 prisoners, including some infants. No food was given, only water. A witness of high standing says that the priests were treated more brutally than the rest.

The greatest number of prisoners from Louvain were taken by train to Cologne. Some were afterwards marched through Cologne for the people to see, with ropes round their necks, and they were told that they would be hanged or shot. After being there a week, some were taken back to Belgium and allowed to go free. The trucks used were abominably dirty, and the prisoners were not allowed to leave them for any object. The report continues :—

"The ill-treatment of the prisoners was under the eyes and often by the direction or with the sanction of officers, and officers themselves took part in it. . . .

"Whatever may have been the case when the burning began on the evening of the 25th, it appears clear that the subsequent destruction and outrages were done with a set purpose. It was not until the 26th that the Library, and other University buildings, the church of St. Peter, and many houses were set on fire. It is to be noticed that cases occur in the depositions in which humane acts by individual officers and soldiers are mentioned, or in which officers are said to have expressed regret at being obliged to carry out orders for cruel action against the civilians. . . . It was to the discipline rather than the want of discipline in the army that these outrages, which we are obliged to describe as systematic, were due. . . .

"We are driven to the conclusion that the harrying of the villages in the district, the burning of a large part of Louvain, the massacres there, the marching out of the prisoners, and the transport to Cologne (all done without enquiry as to whether the particular persons seized or killed had committed any wrongful act), were due to a calculated policy carried out scientifically and deliberately, not merely with the sanction

but under the direction of higher military authorities, and were not due to any provocation or resistance by the civilian population."

The Germans were in Termonde from September 4 to 6, and again about the 16th. The partial destruction of the town on the 5th was in consequence of the failure of the Burgomaster to return by the time ordered by the soldiers. There were many outrages. Prisoners were taken to Lebbeke, where 300 were locked up in the church for three days. On only one of the three days were they given any food, a piece of bread and a little water. The soldiers spat in the faces of the prisoners and called them "swine." In the fighting in the town, says a witness, "the Germans placed their rifles on the shoulders of the civilians and fired at the Belgian soldiers who returned the fire. Forty of the civilians were killed by their own countrymen."

The disregard for the lives of civilians is strikingly shown in extracts from German soldiers' diaries, of which the following are representative examples. Bombardier Wetzel of the 2nd Mounted Battery, 1st Kurhessian Field Artillery Regiment, No. 11, records an incident which happened near Lille on October 11: "We had no fight, but we caught about twenty men and shot them." By this time killing not in a fight would seem to have passed into a habit. A soldier, evidently in the First Regiment of Foot Guards, was at Ermeton on August 24: "We took about 1,000 prisoners. At least 500 were shot. The village was burnt because the inhabitants had also shot."

CONCLUSIONS OF THE COMMITTEE.

If a line is drawn on a map from the Belgian frontier to Liège and continued to Charleroi, and a second line drawn from Liège to Malines, a figure resembling an irregular Y will be formed. It is along this Y that most of the systematic (as opposed to isolated) outrages were committed. If the period from August 4 to August 30 is taken it will be found to cover most of these organised outrages. Termonde and Alost extend, it is true, beyond the Y lines, and they belong to the month of September.

Here a distinction may be drawn between two classes of outrages. Individual acts of brutality were very widely committed. In all wars many shocking and outrageous acts must be expected. Drunkenness is the cause of much crime, and in the German Army little seems to have been done to repress this source of danger.

"In the present war [say the Committee], and this is the gravest charge against the German Army—the evidence shows that the killing of non-combatants was carried out to an extent for which no previous war between nations claiming to be civilised furnishes any precedent. That this killing was done as part of a deliberate plan is clear from the facts hereinbefore set forth regarding Louvain, Aerschot, Dinant and other towns. The killing was done under orders in each place. It began at a certain fixed date, and stopped (with some few exceptions) at another fixed date. Some of the officers who carried out the work did it reluctantly, and said they were obeying directions from their chiefs. The same remarks apply to the destruction of property. House-

burning was part of the programme ; and villages, even large parts of a city, were given to the flames as part of the terrorising policy. . . .

"The German Government have sought to justify their severities on the grounds of military necessity, and have excused them as retaliation for cases in which civilians fired on German troops. There may have been cases in which such firing occurred, but no proof has ever been given, or, to our knowledge, attempted to be given, of such cases, nor of the stories of shocking outrages perpetrated by Belgian men and women on German soldiers. . . .

"The invaders appear to have proceeded upon the theory that any chance shot coming from an unexpected place was fired by civilians. . . . Troops belonging to the same army often fire by mistake upon each other. That the German Army was no exception to this rule is proved not only by many Belgian witnesses, but by the admission of German soldiers themselves recorded in their war diaries. . . . In such cases the obvious interest of the soldier is to conceal his mistake, and a convenient method of doing so is to raise the cry of 'francs-tireurs.' Doubtless the German soldiers often believed that the civilian population, naturally hostile, had in fact attacked them. This attitude of mind may have been fostered by the German authorities themselves before the troops passed the frontier, and thereafter stories of alleged atrocities . . . were circulated amongst the troops and roused their anger. . . . If there is any truth in such stories, no attempt has been made to establish it.

"An invading army may be entitled to shoot at sight a civilian caught red-handed, or anyone who though not caught red-handed is proved guilty on inquiry. But this was the practice followed by the German troops: they seized the civilians of the village indiscriminately and killed them, or such as they selected from among them, without the least regard to guilt or innocence. . . .

" 'I am merely executing orders, and I should be shot if I did not execute them,' said an officer to a witness at Louvain. At Brussels another officer says: 'I have not done one-hundredth part of what we have been ordered to do by the High German Military authorities.'

"As we have already observed, it would be unjust to charge upon the German Army generally acts of cruelty which, whether due to drunkenness or not, were done by men of brutal instincts and unbridled passions. Such crimes were sometimes punished by the officers. They were in some cases offset by acts of humanity and kindness. But . . . had less licence been allowed to the soldiers, and had they not been set to work to slaughter civilians, there would have been fewer of those cases in which a depraved and morbid cruelty appears.

"Two painful classes of murders in particular requirespecial mention, because one of them is almost new, and the other altogether unprecedented. The former is the seizure of peaceful citizens as so-called hostages to be kept as a pledge for the conduct of the civil population, or as a means to secure some military advantage, or to compel the payment of a contribution, the hostages being shot if the condition imposed by the arbitrary will of the invader is not fulfilled. Such hostage taking . . . is opposed both to the rules of war and to every principle of justice and

humanity. The latter kind of murder is the killing of the innocent inhabitants of a village because shots have been fired, or are alleged to have been fired, on the troops by someone in the village. For this practice no previous example and no justification has been or can be pleaded. . . . Such acts are no part of war, for innocence is entitled to respect even in war. They are mere murders, just as the drowning of the innocent passengers and crews on a merchant ship is murder and not an act of war. . . .

"It was with amazement and almost with incredulity that the Committee first read the depositions relating to such acts. But when the evidence regarding Liège was followed by that regarding Aerschot, Louvain, Andenne, Dinant, and the other towns and villages, the cumulative effect of such a mass of concurrent testimony became irresistible, and we were driven to the conclusion that the things described had really happened. The question then arose how they could have happened. . . . The excesses recently committed in Belgium were, moreover, too widespread and too uniform in their character to be mere sporadic outbursts of passion or rapacity. The explanation seems to be that these excesses were committed—in some cases ordered, in others allowed—on a system and in pursuance of a set purpose. That purpose was to strike terror into the civil population and dishearten the Belgian troops, so as to crush down resistance and extinguish the very spirit of self-defence."

TREATMENT OF CIVILIAN POPULATION.

Enough has been said as to the killing of civilians in Belgium. Similar outrages continued as the German armies passed into France, but the evidence before the Committee was less, because there is no body of French refugees in England, and French witnesses have laid their evidence before their own Government. But many shocking outrages are recorded. Take, for example, this story by an English non-commissioned officer:—

"During the retirement of the Germans after the Marne about September 16 or 17, I was on patrol duty in charge of five privates. . . . We were searching a village for a patrol of Uhlans at 3.30 p.m.; we found them in a house; about ten got outside, but we did not let them get to their horses and we killed them all. I searched the house; everything was in disorder. On the floor in the corner near the fireplace I saw two women and two children, the ages of the former apparently about 30 and 25. One was dead, the one I judged to be the elder. Her left arm had been cut off just below the elbow. The floor was covered with blood; I think she had bled to death; I felt her other pulse at once. . . . The younger woman was just alive but quite unconscious. Her right leg had been cut off above the knee. . . . There were two little children, a boy about four or five, and a girl of about six or seven. The boy's left hand was cut off at the wrist and the girl's right hand at the same place. They were both quite dead. . . ."

Though the German authorities, in carrying out their policy of systematic terrorism in selected districts, usually drew some distinction between men on the one hand and women and children on the other,

yet, as we have seen, there were many instances of appalling outrages on women and children. The troops were not kept from drunkenness, and the natural results followed.

"From the very first women were not safe. At Liège women and children were chased about the streets by soldiers. A witness gives a story, very circumstantial in its details, of how women were publicly raped in the market place of the city, five young German officers assisting. At Aerschot men and women were deliberately shot when coming out of burning houses. At Liège, Louvain, Sempst, and Malines, women were burned to death, either because they were surprised and stupefied by the fumes of the conflagration, or because they were prevented from escaping by German soldiers. A humane German officer, witnessing the ruin of Aerschot, exclaims in disgust: 'I am a father myself, and I cannot bear this. It is not war, but butchery.' Officers as well as men succumbed to the temptation of drink."

It is right to say that there is evidence tending to show that aggravated crimes against women were sometimes severely punished; but often discipline was loose, and during the German retreat on the Aisne, many women and girls were violated and killed. There is frequent mention of certain hideous forms of mutilation, such as the cutting off of hands; other cases suggest a perverted form of sexual instinct.

"We find many well-established cases of the slaughter (often accompanied by mutilation) of whole families, including not infrequently that of quite small children. In two cases it seems to be clear that preparations were made to burn a family alive. . . . The authorities must have known or ought to have known that cruelties of this character were being perpetrated, nor can anyone doubt that they could have been stopped by swift and decisive action on the part of the heads of the German army."

Offences against infants and young children were very numerous. They were, no doubt, for the most part the acts of drunken soldiers, but an incident has been recorded which discloses the fact that even sober and highly-placed officers were not always disposed to place a high value on child-life. Thus a General, wishing to be conducted to the Town Hall at Lebbeke, remarked in French to his guide, who was accompanied by a small boy, "If you do not show me the right way I will shoot you and your boy."

There is a considerable body of evidence with reference to the practice of the Germans of using civilians and sometimes military prisoners as screens from behind which they could fire upon the Belgian troops in the hope that the Belgians would not return the fire for fear of killing or wounding their own fellow-countrymen. "Setting aside doubtful cases," says the Report, "there remains evidence which satisfies us that on so many occasions as to justify its being described as a practice, the German soldiers, under the eyes and by the direction of their officers, were guilty of this act."

Old and young, men and women, were constantly used in this way. To take one or two cases, seven or eight women and five or six very young children were thus utilised by some Uhlans between Landrécies and Guise. Near Malines, early in September, about ten children

roped together were driven in front of a German force. Near Willebroeck some civilians, including a number of children, a woman and one old man, were driven in front of the German troops. German officers were present, and one woman who refused to advance was stabbed twice with a bayonet, and a little child who ran up to her had half its head blown away by a rifle.

The German troops were provided with various appliances for rapidly setting fire to houses, and these were constantly used.

OFFENCES AGAINST COMBATANTS.

Such acts may not in all cases be deliberate and cold-blooded violations of the usages of war. There may sometimes be extenuating circumstances; but the Committee say that—

“After making all allowances, there remain certain instances in which it is clear that quarter was refused to persons desiring to surrender when it ought to have been given, or that persons already so wounded as to be incapable of fighting further were wantonly shot or bayoneted. The cases . . . all present features generally similar, and in several of them men who had been left wounded in the trenches when a trench was carried by the enemy, were found, when their comrades subsequently re-took the trench, to have been slaughtered, although evidently helpless, or else they would have escaped with the rest of the retreating force.”

In cases of firing on hospitals, Red Cross ambulances, or stretcher-bearers, there is obvious difficulty in proving intention, especially in these days of long-range artillery fire; but in various cases military observers believe that the firing was wilful, and as regards ambulances there was a good deal of explicit evidence. On the whole, the Committee do not find proof of a systematic firing on hospitals or ambulances; “but it is not possible to believe that much care was taken to avoid this.” There is abundant testimony as to firing on stretcher-bearers.

Cases of the Red Cross being abused are much more definite. There are several accounts of fire being opened, sometimes at very short range, by machine-guns which had been disguised in a German Red Cross ambulance or car; this was aggravated in one case near Tirlemont by the German soldiers wearing Belgian uniform. There is also a well-attested case of a Red Cross motor-car being used to carry ammunition under command of officers.

“Unless all these statements are wilfully false, which the Committee sees no reason to believe, these acts must have been deliberate, and it does not seem possible that a Red Cross car could be equipped with a machine-gun by soldiers acting without orders. There is also one case of firing from a cottage where the Red Cross flag was flying, and this could not be accidental.”

Cases of the abuse of the white flag are numerous. Sometimes a whole unit advanced as if to surrender, or let the other side advance to receive the pretended surrender, and then opened fire. Under this head we find many depositions by British soldiers and several by

officers. In some cases the firing was from a machine-gun brought up under cover of the white flag.

The depositions taken by Professor Morgan in France strongly corroborate the evidence collected in this country.

"There is, in our opinion, sufficient evidence that these offences have been frequent, deliberate, and in many cases committed by whole units under orders. All the acts mentioned in this part of the Report are in contravention of The Hague Convention."

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

The Committee say that they have come to a definite conclusion upon each of the heads under which the evidence has been classified.

"It is proved:—

- "(1) That there were in many parts of Belgium deliberate and systematically organised massacres of the civil population, accompanied by many isolated murders and other outrages.
- "(2) That in the conduct of the war generally, innocent civilians, both men and women, were murdered in large numbers, women violated, and children murdered.
- "(3) That looting, house-burning, and the wanton destruction of property were ordered and countenanced by the officers of the German Army, that elaborate provision had been made for systematic incendiarism at the very outbreak of the war, and that the burnings and destruction were frequent where no military necessity could be alleged, being indeed part of a system of general terrorisation.
- "(4) That the rules and usages of war were frequently broken, particularly by the using of civilians, including women and children, as a shield for advancing forces exposed to fire, to a less degree by killing the wounded and prisoners, and in the frequent abuse of the Red Cross and the White Flag.

"Sensible as they are of the gravity of these conclusions, the Committee conceive that they would be doing less than their duty if they fail to record them as fully established by the evidence. Murder, lust, and pillage prevailed over many parts of Belgium on a scale unparalleled in any war between civilised nations during the last three centuries.

"Our function is ended when we have stated what the evidence establishes, but we may be permitted to express our belief that these disclosures will not have been made in vain if they touch and rouse the conscience of mankind, and we venture to hope that as soon as the present war is over, the nations of the world in council will consider what means can be provided and sanctions devised to prevent the recurrence of such horrors as our generation is now witnessing."

THE APPENDIX.

The Appendix to the above Report is also issued [Cd. 7895]. In Appendix A are given the depositions of the witnesses. These depositions are given as nearly as possible in the exact words of the

witness, and wherever a statement has been made tending to exculpate the German troops it has been given in full. The originals remain in the custody of the Home Department, where they will be available in case of need for reference after the conclusion of the war.

Appendix B gives extracts from diaries and papers, the gist of many of which appear at length in the body of the Report. In some cases they were taken from German corpses; in others from German prisoners of war. Other Appendices give German Proclamations, an extract from the Hague Convention on the laws of war, and the depositions taken by Professor Morgan, and the document concludes with facsimiles of certain of the diaries.

SUMMARY OF A DISPATCH FROM MAJOR-GENERAL SIR CHARLES DOBELL, DESCRIBING THE CONQUEST OF CAMEROON.
(PUBLISHED JUNE 1.)

Cameroon was defended by a well-led and well-trained force, plentifully supplied with machine-guns. In the early stages of the war, when our forces were insufficient to hold the posts we had captured and also to advance into the heart of the colony, there were several regrettable incidents. The bush country lent itself to ambush, and sickness among the native troops added to our difficulties. The first half of the campaign was occupied in clearing the coast and boundaries of the enemy; the second in driving them by converging columns towards Yaunde, their improvised capital on the central plateau. From Yaunde many of the enemy escaped south over the Spanish border; isolated districts in the north were cleared, and fighting came to an end in the middle of February this year.

The capital of the colony, Duala, was occupied on September 27, 1914, and it was made the base of operations. From Duala two railways run, one to the north and one to the east. Along these much of the earlier fighting took place.

"I may remark incidentally [says Sir Charles Dobell], that neither the climate nor the character of the country favoured the offensive, officers and men were exposed to the most trying conditions—incessant tropical rains, absence of roads, or even paths, a country covered with the densest African forest—all contributed to the difficulties with which the troops were faced. Had it not been for the existing railways, which formed a line of advance as well as supply, it is difficult to see how progress could have been made. The country in the immediate vicinity of Duala is perhaps typical of the greater portion of Cameroon in which my troops have operated, excepting beyond Northern railhead, where the country becomes open, and, on account of its greater altitude, healthier; but all the coast line, and for some 150 miles inland, one meets the same monotonous impenetrable African forest fringed, on the coast line, by an area of mangrove swamp in varying depth. The zone is well watered by numerous rivers, of which the Wuri, Sanaga, and Njong present serious military obstacles. Once outside this belt conditions change at once, supplies and live stock are obtainable, and open grass lands are reached."

To the north after a repulse, when native troops encountered infantry for the first time, Jabassi was taken on October 14, and a force was pushed on to Njamtan. The next objective was Edea, on which an advance was made in three directions, by the Sanaga and Njong rivers and across country. It was occupied on October 26. Then Buea, Victoria, and Soppo were taken, and a push was made up the northern railway by a force under Colonel Gorges. This fought its way to Nkongsamba (railhead) by December 10. Two aeroplanes were taken there, the first that had ever arrived in West Africa.

Early in 1915 the situation was as follows :—

British troops holding Duala, the Northern Railway with Bare, Victoria and Dibombe (a defended post south-west of Jabassi). French troops on the line of the Midland Railway up to and including Edea, where they were heavily but unsuccessfully attacked on January 5. Towards the end of 1914 the French under General Aymerich, and Belgian troops based on French Equatorial Africa, commenced to make their presence felt in the South and South-East. In the North an Allied force was fully occupied in observing Mora and Garua. At and near Ossidinge a small British force from Nigeria and German forces were in contact.

Notwithstanding the number of troops, British, French, and Belgian, in the country it was impossible at this period to co-ordinate their movements, owing to the vastness of the area over which they were scattered and the impossibility of establishing any means of intercommunication between the various Commanders.

In March an Allied Conference was held at Duala to consider a joint advance on Yaunde, now the seat of administration. All available British forces were concentrated at Ngwe-So Dibanga, on the Kele River. A force was dispatched to Sakbajeme, on the Sanaga, to hold the crossing. It soon became evident that the enemy was withdrawing troops from other parts of the colony to resist our further advance. On May 1 French and British columns moved forward to Eseka and Wum Biagas, and the French joined our troops at Wum Biagas. The French advance from Equatorial Africa had not been as rapid as expected, and on May 11 neither Dume nor Lomie had been captured. It was determined to push on from Wum Biagas towards Yaunde in spite of difficulties of climate and sickness.

This attempt on Yaunde failed. "Handicapped by the almost impenetrable bush and a terrain which afforded many defensive positions, the advance became exceedingly slow. At every turn of the road the advance was met by machine-gun fire." The line of communications was attacked. At last sickness and the stubborn resistance of the enemy prevented any further progress, and a retirement was decided on to the line of the Kele River.

There was now an unavoidable lull in the operations owing to the rains. In August a plan was drawn up between the Allies by which Cameroon was conquered. Yaunde was the point aimed at. French troops at Bertua and Dume were to co-operate; a force was to move parallel to the eastern frontier of Muni, cross the Campo River towards Elbolowa; the troops at the northern railhead were to help the British

force at Ossidinge in its attempt to link up with other columns, and a force was to land at Campo and move parallel to the frontier of Spanish Guinea.

To take the main operations. On October 9 Wum Biagas was recaptured, Sende was occupied on October 25, and Eseka on October 30. By November 23 both British and French forces were ready for the final advance.

The advance was generally carried out by a main body with two wings on as wide a front as the nature of the country permitted. This disconcerted the enemy, and it became apparent that his strength was becoming exhausted. By November 26 the French had fought their way through to Mangeles, and on December 17 our troops reached open country. In the meantime the country round the northern railhead had been cleared, and touch had been established with General Cunliffe's columns near Nachtigal rapids.

On January 1 Colonel Gorges entered Yaunde. The enemy appeared to have completely broken under pressure from all sides. "Allied troops from the north, troops from French Equatorial Africa and the Belgian Congo commenced to arrive in Yaunde during the first week in January. It is, I think," says General Dobell, "a remarkable fact that troops that had fought and marched for a period of seventeen months should have converged on their objective within a few days of one another."

DESPATCHES FROM LORD FRENCH AND GENERAL SIR JOHN
MAXWELL, DESCRIBING THE SUPPRESSION OF THE RE-
BELLION IN IRELAND. (PUBLISHED JULY 22.)

LORD FRENCH'S REPORT.

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
HOME FORCES, HORSE GUARDS,
LONDON, S.W., *May 29, 1916.*

MY LORD,—

I have the honour to forward herewith a Report which I have received from the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Irish Command, relating to the recent outbreak in Dublin and the measures taken for its suppression.

2. It will be observed that the rebellion broke out in Dublin at 12.15 p.m. on April 24th, and that by 5.20 p.m. on the same afternoon a considerable force from the Curragh had arrived in Dublin to reinforce the garrison, and other troops were on their way from Athlone, Belfast and Templemore. The celerity with which these reinforcements became available says much for the arrangements which had been made to meet such a contingency.

3. I was informed of the outbreak by wire on the afternoon of the 24th ult., and the 59th Division at St. Albans was at once put under orders to proceed to Ireland, and arrangements were put in train for their transport. After seeing General Friend I gave orders for the movement of two brigades to commence as soon as their transport

could be arranged. I am aware that in doing so I was acting beyond the powers which were delegated to me, but I considered the situation to be so critical that it was necessary to act at once without reference to the Army Council.

4. On the morning of the 28th April General Sir John Maxwell, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., C.V.O., D.S.O., arrived in Ireland to assume command.

5. I beg to bring to your notice the assistance afforded to me by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, who met every request made to them, for men, guns, and transport with the greatest promptitude, and whose action enabled me to reinforce and maintain the garrisons in the South and West of Ireland without unduly drawing upon the troops which it was desirable to retain in England.

I have the honour to be,
Your Lordship's most obedient Servant,
FRENCH, Field-Marshal,
Commanding-in-Chief, Home Forces.

GENERAL MAXWELL'S REPORT.

FROM GENERAL OFFICER, COMMANDING-IN-CHIEF, FORCES IN IRELAND,
TO FIELD-MARSHAL, COMMANDING-IN-CHIEF, HOME FORCES.

HEADQUARTERS, IRISH COMMAND,
DUBLIN, May 25, 1916.

MY LORD,—

I have the honour to report the operations of the Forces now under my command from Monday, April 24, when the rising in Dublin began.

1. On Easter Monday, 24th April, at 12.15 P.M. a telephone message was received from Dublin Metropolitan Police saying that Dublin Castle was being attacked by armed Sinn Féiners. This was immediately confirmed by the Dublin Garrison Adjutant, who reported that, in the absence of Colonel Kennard, the Garrison Commander, who had left his office shortly before, and was prevented by the rebels from returning, he had ordered all available troops from Portobello, Richmond, and Royal Barracks to proceed to the Castle, and the 6th Reserve Cavalry Regiment towards Sackville Street.

The fighting strength of the troops available in Dublin at this moment were :—

	Officers.	Other Ranks.
6th Reserve Cavalry Regt. - - - - -	35	851
3rd Royal Irish Regt. - - - - -	18	385
10th Royal Dublin Fusiliers - - - - -	37	430
3rd Royal Irish Rifles - - - - -	21	650

Of these troops, an inlying picquet of 400 men, which for some days past had been held in readiness, proceeded at once, and the remainder followed shortly afterwards. At 12.30 P.M. a telephone message was sent to General Officer Commanding, Curragh, to mobilise the mobile column, which had been arranged for to meet any emergency, and to despatch it dismounted to Dublin by trains which were being sent from

Kingsbridge. This column, under the command of Colonel Portal, consisted of 1,600 officers and other ranks from the 3rd Reserve Cavalry Brigade.

Almost immediately after the despatch of this message telephonic communication in Dublin became very interrupted, and from various sources it was reported that the Sinn Feiners had seized the General Post Office in Sackville Street, the Magazine in Phoenix Park, the Four Courts, Jacob's Biscuit Factory, and had occupied many buildings in various parts of the City. As the occupation of the General Post Office by the Sinn Feiners denied the use of the telegraph, a message reporting the situation in Dublin was sent at 1.10 p.m. to the Naval Centre at Kingstown, asking that the information of the rising might be transmitted by wireless through the Admiralty to you. This was done.

2. The first objectives undertaken by the troops were to recover possession of the Magazine in Phoenix Park, where the rebels had set fire to a quantity of ammunition, to relieve the Castle, and to strengthen the guards on Vice-Regal Lodge and other points of importance. The Magazine was quickly reoccupied, but the troops moving on the Castle were held up by the rebels who had occupied surrounding houses, and had barricaded the streets with carts and other material. Between 1.40 p.m. and 2.0 p.m. 50 men of the 3rd Royal Irish Rifles and 130 men of the 10th Royal Dublin Fusiliers reached the Castle by the Ship Street entrance. At 4.45 p.m. the first train from the Curragh arrived at Kingsbridge Station, and by 5.20 p.m. the whole Cavalry Column, 1,600 strong, under the command of Colonel Portal, had arrived, one train being sent on from Kingsbridge to North Wall by the loop line to reinforce the guard over the docks.

3. During the day the following troops were ordered to Dublin :—

(a) A battery of four 18-pounders R.F.A., from the Reserve Artillery Brigade at Athlone.

(b) The 4th Dublin Fusiliers from Templemore.

(c) A composite battalion from Belfast.

(d) An additional 1,000 men from the Curragh.

This message being sent by one of the troop trains returning to the Curragh.

During the afternoon and evening small parties of troops were engaged with the rebels.

The 3rd Royal Irish Regiment on their way to the Castle were held up by the rebels in the South Dublin Union, which they attacked and partially occupied ; a detachment of 2 officers and 50 men from the 6th Reserve Cavalry Regiment which was convoying some ammunition from North Wall was surrounded in Charles Street, but succeeded in parking their convoy and defended this with great gallantry for 3½ days, when they were relieved ; during this defence the officer in command was killed and the remaining officer wounded.

The rebels in St. Stephen's Green were attacked, and picquets with machine-guns were established in the United Service Club and the Shelbourne Hotel with a view to dominating the square and its exits.

At 9.35 p.m. Colonel Kennard, Officer Commanding Troops, Dublin, reached the Castle with another party of 86 men of the 3rd Royal Irish

Regiment. The defence of the Docks at North Wall was undertaken by Major H. F. Somerville, commanding a detachment from the School of Musketry, Dollymount, reinforced by 330 officers and men of the 9th Reserve Cavalry Regiment. The occupation of the Customs House, which dominated Liberty Hall, was carried out at night, and was of great assistance in later operations against Liberty Hall.

4. The situation at midnight was that we held the Magazine, Phoenix Park, the Castle and the Ship Street entrance to it, the Royal Hospital, all Barracks, the Kingsbridge, Amiens Street, and North Wall railway stations, the Dublin Telephone Exchange in Crown Alley, the Electric Power Station at Pigeon House Fort, Trinity College, Mountjoy Prison, and Kingstown Harbour. The Sinn Feiners held Sackville Street and blocks of buildings on each side of this, including Liberty Hall, with their headquarters at the General Post Office, the Four Courts, Jacob's Biscuit Factory, South Dublin Union, St. Stephen's Green, all the approaches to the Castle except the Ship Street entrance, and many houses all over the city, especially about Balls Bridge and Beggar's Bush.

5. The facility with which the Sinn Feiners were able to seize so many important points throughout the city was, in my opinion, due to the fact that armed bodies of civilians have been continually allowed to parade in and march through the streets of Dublin and throughout the country without interference.

The result was that the movement of large forces of armed civilians, particularly on a holiday such as Easter Monday, passed, if not unnoticed, unchecked, and no opposition could be offered to them at the moment when they decided to act.

Further, the Dublin police, being unarmed, and powerless to deal with these armed rebels, were withdrawn from the areas occupied by them.

6. At the time of the rising Major-General Friend, then commanding the troops in Ireland, was on short leave in England, and when visiting your headquarters at the Horse Guards on that day heard the serious news from Dublin. He returned that night, and arrived in Dublin early on the morning of April 25. He has informed me that at a conference with you it was decided to despatch at once two infantry brigades of the 59th Division from England to Ireland, and that the remaining infantry brigade and artillery of this Division were to be held in readiness to follow if required.

7. On April 25 Brigadier-General W. H. M. Lowe, Commanding the Reserve Cavalry Brigade at the Curragh, arrived at Kingsbridge Station at 3.45 A.M. with the leading troops from the 25th (Irish) Reserve Infantry Brigade, and assumed command of the forces in the Dublin area, which were roughly 2,300 men of the Dublin garrison, the Curragh Mobile Column of 1,500 dismounted cavalymen, and 840 men of the 25th Irish Reserve Infantry Brigade.

8. In order to relieve and get communication with the Castle, Colonel Portal, Commanding the Curragh Mobile Column, was ordered to establish a line of posts from Kingsbridge Station to Trinity College *via* the Castle. This was completed by 12 noon, April 25, and with very little loss. It divided the rebel forces into two, gave a safe line of

advance for troops extending operations to the north or south, and permitted communication by despatch rider with some of the Commands. The only means of communication previous to this had been by telephone, which was unquestionably being tapped.

The Dublin University O.T.C., under Captain E. H. Alton, and subsequently Major G. A. Harris, held the College buildings until the troops arrived. The holding of these buildings separated the rebel centre round the General Post Office from that round St. Stephen's Green; it established a valuable base for the collection of reinforcements as they arrived, and prevented the rebels from entering the Bank of Ireland, which is directly opposite to and commanded by the College buildings.

9. During the day the 4th Royal Dublin Fusiliers from Templemore, a composite Ulster battalion from Belfast, and a battery of four 18-pounder guns from the Reserve Artillery Brigade at Athlone arrived, and this allowed a cordon to be established round the northern part of the city from Parkgate, along the North Circular Road to North Wall. Broadstone Railway Station was cleared of rebels, and a barricade near Phibsborough was destroyed by artillery fire.

As a heavy fire was being kept up on the Castle from the rebels located in the Corporation buildings, *Daily Express* offices, and several houses opposite the City Hall, it was decided to attack these buildings. The assault on the *Daily Express* office was successfully carried out under very heavy fire by a detachment of the 5th Royal Dublin Fusiliers under 2nd Lieut. F. O'Neill. The main forces of the rebels now having been located in and around Sackville Street, the Four Courts, and adjoining buildings, it was decided to try to enclose that area north of the Liffey by a cordon of troops so as to localise as far as possible the efforts of the rebels.

10. Towards evening the 178th Infantry Brigade began to arrive at Kingstown, and in accordance with orders received the brigade left Kingstown by road in two columns. The left column, consisting of the 5th and 6th Battalions, Sherwood Foresters, by the Stillorgan-Donnybrook Road and South Circular Road to the Royal Hospital, where it arrived without opposition. The right column, consisting of the 7th and 8th Battalions, Sherwood Foresters, by the main tram route through Balls Bridge, and directed on Merrion Square and Trinity College. This column, with 7th Battalion leading, was held up at the northern corner of Haddington Road and Northumberland Avenue, which was strongly held by rebels, but with the assistance of bombing parties organised and led by Captain Jeffares of the Bombing School at Elm Park, the rebels were driven back.

At 3.25 P.M. the 7th Battalion, Sherwood Foresters, met great opposition from the rebels holding the schools and other houses on the north side of the road close to the bridge at Lower Mount Street, and two officers, one of whom was the Adjutant, Captain Dietrichsen, were killed and seven wounded, including Lieutenant-Colonel Fane, who, though wounded, remained in action.

At about 5.30 P.M. orders were received that the advance to Trinity College was to be pushed forward at all costs, and therefore at about 8

P.M., after careful arrangements, the whole column, accompanied by bombing parties, attacked the schools and houses where the chief opposition lay, the battalions charging in successive waves, carried all before them, but, I regret to say, suffered severe casualties in doing so. Four officers were killed, fourteen wounded, and of other ranks 216 were killed and wounded. The steadiness shown by these two battalions is deserving of special mention, as I understand the majority of the men have less than three months' service.

In view of the opposition met with, it was not considered advisable to push on to Trinity College that night, so at 11 P.M. the 5th South Staffordshire Regiment, from the 176th Infantry Brigade, reinforced this column, and by occupying the positions gained allowed the two battalions Sherwood Foresters to be concentrated at Balls Bridge.

In connexion with this fighting at Mount Street Bridge, where our heaviest casualties occurred, I should like to mention the gallant assistance given by a number of medical men, ladies, nurses, and women servants, who at great risk brought in and tended to the wounded, continuing their efforts even when deliberately fired at by the rebels.

11. Meanwhile severe fighting had taken place in the Sackville Street quarter. At 8 A.M. Liberty Hall, the former Headquarters of the Sinn Feiners, was attacked by field-guns from the south bank of the River Liffey, and by a gun from the patrol ship *Helga*, with the result that considerable progress was made.

During the night of 26th/27th April several fires broke out in this quarter and threatened to become dangerous, as the fire-brigade could not get to work owing to their being fired upon by the rebels. Throughout the day further troops of the 176th Brigade arrived in the Dublin area.

12. On 27th April the 5th Leinsters, 2/6th Sherwood Foresters, 3rd Royal Irish Regiment, the Ulster composite battalion, under the command of Colonel Portal, began and completed by 5 P.M. the forming of a cordon round the rebels in the Sackville Street area, which operation was carried out with small loss. About 12.45 P.M. Linen Hall Barracks, which were occupied by the Army Pay Office, were reported to have been set on fire by the rebels and were destroyed. By nightfall the 177th Infantry Brigade had arrived at Kingstown, where it remained for the night.

13. At 2 A.M. on the 28th April, I arrived at North Wall and found many buildings in Sackville Street burning fiercely, illuminating the whole city, and a fusillade of rifle fire going on in several quarters of the city. Accompanied by several Staff Officers who had come with me, I proceeded to the Royal Hospital. After a conference with Major-General Friend and Brigadier-General Lowe, I instructed the latter to close in on Sackville Street from east and west, and to carry out a house-to-house search in areas gained. I was able to place the 2/4 Lincolns at his disposal for the purpose of forming a cordon along the Grand Canal, so enclosing the southern part of the city and forming a complete cordon round Dublin.

During the afternoon the 2/5th and 2/6th South Staffords arrived at Trinity College, and this additional force allowed me to begin the task

of placing a cordon round the Four Courts area in the same way as the Sackville Street area, which had already been so successfully isolated. During the evening the detachment of the 6th Reserve Cavalry Regiment, which had been escorting ammunition and rifles from North Wall and had been held up in Charles Street, was relieved by armoured motor lorries, which had been roughly armoured with boiler plates by the Inchicore Railway works and placed at my disposal by Messrs. Guinness.

Throughout the night the process of driving out the rebels in and round Sackville Street continued, though these operations were greatly hampered by the fires in this area and by the fact that some of the burning houses contained rebel stores of explosives which every now and again blew up. In other quarters of the city the troops had a trying time dealing with the numerous snipers, who became very troublesome during the hours of darkness.

14. Owing to the considerable opposition at barricades, especially in North King Street, it was not until 9 A.M. on the 29th April that the Four Courts area was completely surrounded.

Throughout the morning the squeezing out of the surrounded areas was vigorously proceeded with, the infantry being greatly assisted by a battery of Field Artillery commanded by Major Hill, who used his guns against the buildings held by the rebels with such good effect that a Red Cross nurse brought in a message from the Rebel leader, P. H. Pearse, asking for terms. A reply was sent that only unconditional surrender would be accepted. At 2 P.M. Pearse surrendered himself unconditionally, and was brought before me, when he wrote and signed notices ordering the various "Commandos" to surrender unconditionally. During the evening the greater part of the rebels in the Sackville Street and Four Courts area surrendered.

15. Early on the 30th April two Franciscan monks informed me that the Rebel leader Macdonagh, declining to accept Pearse's orders, wished to negotiate. He was informed that only unconditional surrender would be accepted, and at 3 P.M. when all preparation for an attack on Jacob's Biscuit Factory, which he held, had been made, Macdonagh and his band of rebels surrendered unconditionally. In the St. Stephen's Green area, Countess Markievicz and her band surrendered and were taken to the Castle. These surrenders practically ended the rebellion in the city of Dublin.

16. Throughout the night of the 30th April/1st May isolated rebels continued to snipe the troops, but during the 1st May these were gradually cleared out, and in conjunction with the police a systematic house-to-house search for rebels and arms was continued.

17. During the severe fighting which took place in Dublin the greatest anxiety was caused by the disquieting reports received from many parts of Ireland, and chiefly from—(a) Co. Dublin, (b) Co. Meath, (c) Co. Louth, (d) Co. Galway, (e) Co. Wexford, (f) Co. Clare, (g) Co. Kerry.

18. On the 27th April, as soon as troops became available, a detachment was sent by sea from Kingstown to Arklow to reinforce the garrison at Kynoch's Explosive Works, and a small party was sent to assist the R.I.C. post over the wireless station at Skerries. On the 28th April a battalion of the Sherwood Foresters was despatched by rail to Athlone to

protect the artillery and military stores there and to hold the communication over the River Shannon.

19. Brigadier-General Stafford, the Garrison Commander at Queens-town, was directed to use his discretion in the employment of troops under his command, and on 30th April he was reinforced from England by one battalion of the 179th Brigade, 60th Division, a battalion of the Royal Marines, and later by the remainder of the 179th Brigade.

20. Brigadier-General Hackett-Pain, who assumed command of the troops in Ulster, made effective use of the troops under his command, and it was largely due to the dispositions made by these two Commanders that the Sinn Feiners in the South and North of Ireland were restrained from taking a more active part in the rebellion.

21. I received the greatest assistance from the Inspector-General, Royal Irish Constabulary, and from all his inspectors and men, and throughout the rebellion I worked in the closest co-operation with them. In many districts small posts of these gallant men were isolated and had to defend themselves against overwhelming numbers, which they successfully did except in very few cases.

It was with great regret I received the report on 28th April that a body of Royal Irish Constabulary, under Inspector Gray, had been ambushed by the rebels at Ashbourne, which resulted in Inspectors Gray and Smith and eight constables being killed and fourteen wounded. It was not until 30th April that I was able to spare a mobile column to deal with this body of rebels, the leaders of which were secured.

In other parts of Ireland similar attacks on police posts had been made by armed bands of Sinn Feiners. In order to deal with these, as soon as the Dublin rebels had been crushed, I organised various mobile columns, each consisting of from one to two companies of infantry, a squadron of cavalry, one 18-pounder gun, and an armoured car.

Each column was allotted a definite area, which, in close co-operation with the local police, was gone through, and dangerous Sinn Feiners and men who were known to have taken an active part in the rising were arrested; in addition many arms belonging to Sinn Feiners were surrendered or seized. I am glad to be able to report that the presence of these columns had the best possible effect on the people in country districts, in many of which troops had not been seen for years.

22. That splendid body of men, the Dublin Metropolitan Police, could give me little or no assistance, because they were unarmed. Had they been armed I doubt if the rising in Dublin would have had the success it did.

23. I am glad to report that the conduct of the troops was admirable; their cheerfulness, courage, and good discipline, under the most trying conditions, was excellent. Although doors and windows of shops and houses had to be broken open, no genuine case of looting has been reported to me, which I consider reflects the greatest credit on all ranks.

24. I wish to acknowledge the great assistance I received from the Provost of Trinity College; the clergy of all denominations; civilian medical men; Red Cross nurses, who were untiring in their attention to the wounded, often rendered under heavy fire; ambulances provided by Royal Ambulance Corps; the Irish Volunteer Training Corps and

the members of St. John Ambulance Corps; the Civilian and Officers Training Corps motor cyclists, who fearlessly carried despatches through streets infested with snipers; telegraph operators and engineers; and from the lady operators of the Telephone Exchange, to whose efforts the only means of rapid communication remained available. I am glad to be able to record my opinion that the feelings of the bulk of the citizens of Dublin being against the Sinn Feiners materially influenced the collapse of the rebellion.

25. I deplore the serious losses which the troops and the civilian volunteers have suffered during these very disagreeable operations.

I have the honour to be,
Your most obedient servant,
J. G. MAXWELL, *General*.

REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE IRISH REBELLION. (ISSUED JULY 3.)

The Commission consisted of Lord Hardinge of Penshurst (Chairman), Mr. Justice Shearman, and Sir Mackenzie Chalmers. It was appointed "to inquire into the causes of the recent outbreak of rebellion in Ireland, and into the conduct and degree of responsibility of the civil and military executive in Ireland in connexion therewith."

CONCLUSIONS OF THE REPORT.

It is outside the scope of your Majesty's instructions to us to inquire how far the policy of the Irish Executive was adopted by the Cabinet as a whole, or to attach responsibility to any but the Civil and Military Executive in Ireland; but the general conclusion that we draw from the evidence before us is that the main cause of the rebellion appears to be that lawlessness was allowed to grow up unchecked, and that Ireland for several years past has been administered on the principle that it was safer and more expedient to leave law in abeyance if collision with any faction of the Irish people could thereby be avoided.

Such a policy is the negation of that cardinal rule of government which demands that the enforcement of law and the preservation of order should always be independent of political expediency.

We consider that the importation of large quantities of arms into Ireland after the lapse of the Arms Act, and the toleration of drilling by large bodies of men first in Ulster, and then in other districts of Ireland, created conditions which rendered possible the recent troubles in Dublin and elsewhere.

It appears to us that reluctance was shown by the Irish Government to repress by prosecution written and spoken seditious utterances, and to suppress the drilling and manœuvring of armed forces known to be under the control of men who were openly declaring their hostility to your Majesty's Government and their readiness to welcome and assist your Majesty's enemies.

This reluctance was largely prompted by the pressure brought to

bear by the Parliamentary representatives of the Irish people, and in Ireland itself there developed a widespread belief that no repressive measures would be undertaken by the Government against sedition. This led to a rapid increase of preparations for insurrection and was the immediate cause of the recent outbreak.

We are of opinion that from the commencement of the present war all seditious utterances and publications should have been firmly suppressed at the outset, and if juries or magistrates were found unwilling to enforce this policy further powers should have been invoked under the existing Acts for the Defence of the Realm.

We are also of opinion that on the outbreak of war all drilling and manœuvring by unrecognised bodies of men, whether armed or unarmed, should have been strictly prohibited, and that as soon as it became known to the Irish Government that the Irish Volunteers and the Citizen Army were under the control of men prepared to assist your Majesty's enemies if the opportunity should be offered to them, all drilling and open carrying of arms by these bodies of men should have been forcibly suppressed.

It does not appear to be disputed that the authorities in the spring of 1916, while believing that the seditious bodies would not venture unaided to break into insurrection, were convinced that they were prepared to assist a German landing.

We are further of opinion that at the risk of a collision early steps should have been taken to arrest and prosecute leaders and organisers of sedition.

For the reasons before given, we do not think that any responsibility rests upon the Lord-Lieutenant. He was appointed in February, 1915, and was in no way answerable for the policy of the Government.

We are, however, of the opinion that the Chief Secretary as the administrative head of your Majesty's Government in Ireland is primarily responsible for the situation that was allowed to arise and the outbreak that occurred.

Sir Matthew Nathan assumed office as Under-Secretary to the Irish Government in September, 1914, only. In our view he carried out with the utmost loyalty the policy of the Government, and of his immediate superior the Chief Secretary, but we consider that he did not sufficiently impress upon the Chief Secretary during the latter's prolonged absences from Dublin the necessity for more active measures to remedy the situation in Ireland which on December 18 last in a letter to the Chief Secretary he described as "most serious and menacing."

We are satisfied that Sir Neville Chamberlain, the Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and Colonel Edgeworth-Johnstone, the Chief Commissioner of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, required their subordinates to furnish, and did receive from their subordinates, full and exact reports as to the nature, progress, and aims of the various armed associations in Ireland. From these sources the Government had abundant material on which they could have acted many months before the leaders themselves contemplated any actual rising.

For the conduct, zeal, and loyalty of the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Metropolitan Police we have nothing but praise.

We do not attach any responsibility to the military authorities in Ireland for the rebellion or its results. As long as Ireland was under civil government those authorities had nothing to do with the suppression of sedition. Their duties were confined to securing efficiency in their own ranks and to the promotion of recruiting, and they could only aid in the suppression of disorder when duly called on by the civil power. By the middle of 1915 it was obvious to the military authorities that their efforts in favour of recruiting were being frustrated by the hostile activities of the Sinn Fein supporters, and they made representations to the Government to that effect. The general danger of the situation was clearly pointed out to the Irish Government by the military authorities, on their own initiative, in February last, but the warning fell on unheeding ears.

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT.

The terms of reference to the Commission were :—

To inquire into the causes of the recent outbreak of rebellion in Ireland, and into the conduct and degree of responsibility of the civil and military executive in Ireland in connexion therewith.

The report deals with the following matters :—

- (a) The constitution of the Irish Executive, in so far as it is concerned with the maintenance of law and order ;
- (b) The legal power vested in that Executive ; and
- (c) The history of events leading up to the outbreak of April 24, with observations thereon.

Discussing the system of executive government in Ireland, the report says that by the terms of his patent the Lord-Lieutenant, who lives in Ireland, is responsible for the civil government of the country, and the naval and military forces of the Crown in Ireland are under his orders. But, when the Chief Secretary is in the Cabinet and the Lord-Lieutenant is not, all powers and responsibility are in practice vested in the Chief Secretary. His policy is the policy of the British Government as a whole, and it is obviously impossible that there should be any other independent authority or responsibility in Ireland. For many years past the office of Lord-Lieutenant has been a ceremonial office ; apart from the exercise of the prerogative of mercy he has no executive functions. Proclamations, appointments, and other State documents are issued in his name, but they are put before him for signature without previous consultation. He is only furnished with information as to the state of the country which he nominally governs when he asks for it, and then as a matter of courtesy. The military and naval forces in Ireland take their orders from the War Office and Admiralty respectively.

As to the Chief Secretary, it is pointed out that this is a political office, changing with the Government. The Executive Government of Ireland is entirely in his hands, subject to the control of the Cabinet. When the Chief Secretary is a member of the Cabinet he is, of necessity, to a great extent an absentee from Ireland. He has to attend Cabinet meetings, and he alone can with authority answer questions and defend the Government policy in the House of Commons.

Although in the position of a Secretary of State, he has no Parliamentary Under-Secretary, and the Irish law officers are frequently not members of the House of Commons. During the last two and a half years of Mr. Birrell's nine years' tenure of office Parliament has been in almost continuous session. He had, therefore, during this critical period but little opportunity of making himself personally acquainted with the state of affairs in Ireland. He was dependent for information on the reports of his Under-Secretary and the advice given by those Irish members of Parliament whom he chose to consult. The Under-Secretary for practical purposes can only take action under authority delegated to him by the Chief Secretary. His duty is to report fully and fairly to his Chief all information that he can obtain, to give his advice freely as to what should be done, and then loyally to carry out the instructions of his Chief without regard to any personal opinion of his own.

Dealing with the police organisation, the Commissioners point out that while the Royal Irish Constabulary, which polices all Ireland except the Dublin district, is a quasi-military force, armed with carbines and taught to shoot, the Dublin Metropolitan Police are unarmed. Consequently, when an armed rebellion broke out in Dublin the police had to be withdrawn from duty. If Dublin, like Cork and Belfast, had been policed by the R.I.C., a thousand armed and disciplined policemen, knowing every nook and cranny of the city, would have been a formidable addition to the thousand soldiers who were available when the rebellion first broke out, and the rebels might have hesitated to face them. Both forces were slightly under strength at the time owing to enlistment in the Army. The two police forces work cordially together, but it is obvious that two separate forces, under separate commands, cannot be in a time of emergency as efficient as a single force under one command. For ordinary police purposes the crimes branch does its work well, but it is not specially qualified to deal with political crime, which in the case of Ireland assumes an international complexion. If the Irish system of Government be regarded as a whole, adds the report, it is anomalous in quiet times, and almost unworkable in times of crisis.

The legal powers of the Irish Executive are reviewed, and the Commissioners say that the Defence of the Realm Act passed on the outbreak of war in August, 1914, appeared to give the authorities ample powers for dealing with any manifestations of sedition or rebellion. As regards Ireland, however, "the teeth of the enactment were drawn" in March, 1915, by the passing of the Defence of the Realm Amendment Act, which gave persons charged under the principal Acts the choice of trial by jury rather than by court-martial. The report adds that power was given to his Majesty to suspend the operation of this provision "in the event of invasion or other special military emergency." But it certainly would have been difficult to have justified the exercise of this suspensory power in Ireland before any actual outbreak in arms had occurred. It was impossible to get a conviction in any case tried by a jury for an offence against law and order, however strong the Crown evidence might be. The power of internment extended to British sub-

jects only when "hostile association" could be established. Therefore, however serious an offence might be, the only remedy was a prosecution before a Court of summary jurisdiction, where six months' imprisonment was the maximum punishment that could be imposed, and when a case was tried before justices there was no certainty that the decision would be in accordance with the evidence.

The Commissioners summarise at some length the incidents which led up to the rising at Easter, emphasising the point on which Mr. Birrell insisted in his evidence that "there is always a section of opinion in Ireland bitterly opposed to the British connexion, and that in times of excitement this section can impose its sentiments on largely increased numbers of the people." Going back to the winter of 1913, when the "Citizen Army," partly armed, was formed during the industrial strikes in Dublin, the Commissioners say that this lawless display of force should have been a warning against the recent policy of permitting the indiscriminate arming of civilians in Ireland in times of turbulence and faction. In periods of peace it may be desirable in an orderly community to disregard some seditious utterances as mere vapouring, but when a country is engaged in a serious struggle sedition alters its aspect and becomes treason, dangerous to the community, and should promptly be suppressed. The Irish people, to quote Sir David Harrel's evidence, "are easily led, and it is therefore the more incumbent on Government to nip lawlessness and disorder in the bud."

The report deals with the surreptitious landing of arms in Ulster in April, 1914, followed by the open landing of arms and ammunition at Howth for the Irish National Volunteers three months later, when Mr. W. V. Harrel, the Assistant Commissioner of Dublin Police, called in soldiers to help in disarming the Volunteers. Mr. Harrel's subsequent resignation, say the Commissioners, was looked upon by the public in Dublin as tantamount to dismissal, and it tended to discourage the Dublin Police from initiative in enforcing the law. Further, his dismissal tended to weaken the authority of the police, as it gave rise to the opinion amongst the more ignorant classes that in any case of disorder the Government might not support their action. No action was taken to prosecute those who landed arms either at Larne or at Howth, and the restriction on the importation of arms into Ireland was removed on the very day after war broke out.

The Commissioners say it is clear that the insurrection was caused by two bodies of men allied together for this purpose and known as the Irish Volunteers and the Citizen Army. It is now a matter of common notoriety that the Irish Volunteers have been in communication with the authorities in Germany and were for a long time known to be supplied with money through Irish-American societies. This was so stated in public by Mr. John McNeill on November 8, 1914. It was suspected long before the outbreak that some of the money came from German sources.

The origin and progress of the Irish Volunteers are next described, and the Commissioners remark: "It is of paramount importance that after the outbreak of the present war no opportunity should have been given for the drilling and arming of any body of men known to be of

seditionary tendency, and no other consideration should have interfered with the enforcing of this duty. After the war broke out there was a considerable wave of feeling in Ireland in favour of the Allies. Reservists joining the colours were greeted with enthusiasm, and recruiting was successful. It was owing to the activities of the leaders of the Sinn Fein movement that the forces of disloyalty gradually and steadily increased, and undermined the initial sentiment of patriotism." Arms and explosives continued during 1915 to be smuggled into Ireland. A flood of seditious literature was disseminated by the leaders of the Irish Volunteer Party early in the war, and certain newspapers were suppressed, but, according to the Under-Secretary, action against the seditious Press was not very consistently taken, and prominent Nationalists were strongly against newspaper suppression. Insufficient attention appears to have been paid to Ireland in both Houses of Parliament.

From March, 1915, to the end of the year, paid organisers were sent throughout the country to enrol and drill Volunteer recruits, and the leaders themselves were active in attending anti-recruiting meetings, at which disloyal speeches were openly made. A considerable number of the younger members of the priesthood in certain districts joined in the movement, and schoolmasters who were followers of the Sinn Fein movement disseminated treason in the Irish language. Action was taken against seditious newspapers, and against certain paid organisers of the Irish Volunteer Party, but this course was strongly opposed by members of the Irish Parliamentary Party and the Nationalist Press. Major Price in his evidence said:—

"One unfortunate thing which hindered us a good deal was the attitude of the Official Nationalist Party and their Press. Whenever General Friend did anything strong in the way of suppressing or deporting these men (the organisers) from Ireland, they at once deprecated it, and said it was a monstrous thing to turn a man out of Ireland."

The following letter intercepted by the Censor in the post on March 24, 1916, and believed to have been written by one of the teaching staff of St. Mary's College, Rathmines, to a friend in America, is quoted as an indication of the spirit that was abroad in disloyal sections of the community:—

"On St. Patrick's Day there were a lot of people put into prison under the Defence of the Realm Act. There was a rumour that they intended to seize the arms of the Volunteers. The police raided a lot of places, but only got one firearm in a house and gave up the job. The Castle is watching them closely, but is afraid to do anything against them. There was a march in the streets of Dublin right through the city in front of the Foreign College of Trinity and before the Parliament House. The Volunteers were all armed with rifles. Eoin McNeill was present and they saluted him as they marched by, and all this under the nose of the Castle. It is a dangerous thing to do, but the Volunteers do not care. They are getting stronger every day. Many efforts are being made, for it is known now that they are our only hope since they put conscription down some time ago. Redmond is done for. Whoever wins the war this country will be wronged and plundered, but the people of Ireland are not disposed of yet. Their spirit is always

improving and growing more Irish. An end is being put to the rule and insolence of the 'Peeler.' They are not nearly so arrogant as they used to be. We want the like of you to strike a blow at John Bull."

The Commissioners quote freely from confidential reports of the heads of the two police forces to show that even before the war the Under-Secretary, and, through him, Mr. Birrell, had full knowledge of the state of affairs. In June, 1914, the Inspector-General of the R.I.C. reported: "Each county will soon have a trained army far outnumbering the police, and those who control the Volunteers will be in a position to dictate to what extent the law of the land may be carried into effect." In September, 1914, the Dublin Metropolitan Police warned the Government as follows:—

"So far as Dublin is concerned the majority of the Irish National Volunteers would follow the lead of the extreme section, and hints have been given that they are not without hope of being able to assume and establish control of the government of Ireland before the present difficulties are over, and that they may attempt some escapade before long."

In October, 1914, the Irish Volunteers held their first Annual Convention. Speeches of the most inflammatory and revolutionary character were delivered. The leaders predicted rebellion and the shedding of blood "in the great fight of Ireland against the British Empire," and many of those present were armed. Reports of the speeches were seen by the Chief Secretary, but he wrote no comment on their contents, and no proceedings were taken. At the end of 1914 the Inspector-General wrote: "The Irish Volunteer organisation has shown itself to be disloyal, seditious, and revolutionary, if the means and opportunity were at hand."

At certain places in Co. Wexford after the promulgation of military orders for the action of the inhabitants in the event of an invasion, counter-notices were placarded calling on the people to disobey the orders issued and to welcome the German troops as friends. In a report submitted in July, 1915, it was stated that information had been received from a reliable source that a sum of \$3,000 had been recently sent from America to the Council of the Irish Volunteers. Among other police reports quoted is one dated December 14, 1915, which says: "The Irish Volunteers were very active during the month and gained 1,300 new members. Lieutenant O'Leary, V.C., was hooted and insulted by a party of Volunteers route marching." In November, 1915, a special report was delivered which contained the following statement:—

"This body of Irish Volunteers numbering 10,000 strong in the provinces, with control of 1,500 rifles and possibly more, thoroughly disloyal and hostile to British government, is apparently now on the increase, and I desire to point out that it might rapidly assume dimensions sufficient to cause anxiety to the military authorities. As it is, in the event of an invasion or of any important reverse to our troops in the field the Irish Volunteer Force would seriously embarrass arrangements for home defence,

In addition Lord Midleton in November, 1915, had an interview with the Chief Secretary in which he strongly urged that the Irish Volunteers should be disarmed and not permitted to parade, and he pressed for the

prosecution of those responsible for seditious speeches. His warnings were entirely neglected.

On December 18, 1915, the Under-Secretary wrote to the Chief Secretary:—

“The present situation in Ireland is most serious and menacing. The enrolled strength of the Sinn Fein Volunteers has increased by a couple of thousand active members, in the last two months to a total of some 13,500, and each group of these is a centre of revolutionary propaganda. Mr. Redmond knows, or should know, that efforts are being made to get arms for the support of this propaganda—that the Irish Volunteers have already some 2,500 rifles, that they have their eyes on the 10,000 in the hands of the supine National Volunteers, and that they are endeavouring to supplement their rifles with shot guns, revolvers, and pistols. New measures possibly requiring additional police at the ports will be required to counter these attempts, and unless in other matters we keep these revolutionaries under observation we shall not be in a position to deal with the outbreak, which we hope will not occur, but which undoubtedly will follow any attempt to enforce conscription, or, even if there is no such attempt, might take place as a result of continual unsuccess of the British Arms.”

Lord Midleton's warnings are also reviewed, and the Commissioners quote from his evidence the statement that on March 6 he saw Lord Wimborne:—

“I found Lord Wimborne took rather a more favourable view of the position in Ireland than Sir Matthew Nathan . . . but the general trend of the conversation showed that he was most anxious to deal with some of the ringleaders, and I gathered, although he did not say so in words, he was unable to move further owing to the general attitude of the Government towards Ireland which it was impossible to disturb.”

The report adds that from January, 1916, the Irish Volunteers grew steadily stronger; they were known to be supplying themselves with quantities of arms and high explosives; and the state of various parts of the country was known to be lawless. In January the heads of the R.I.C. submitted to the Under-Secretary suggestions for the amendment of the Defence of the Realm Act and Regulations. A conference was held at the Castle to consider these recommendations early in February. Amendments of the law and prohibition of the carrying of arms by the Irish Volunteers were suggested as remedial measures. The conference was attended by Mr. O'Connell, Deputy Inspector-General of the R.I.C., the Under-Secretary, General Friend, and the Solicitor-General. The only suggestion discussed was that dealing with explosives—the more serious matters were not even brought forward. Upon this point Mr. O'Connell remarked: “It was my impression, rightly or wrongly, that they had been discussed by higher authorities.”

The publication of newspapers containing seditious articles continued, and a number of seditious books, called “Tracts for the Times,” were circulated. Major Price, of the Army Intelligence Department, stated that he had consultations with regard to this matter, but added: “I liken myself to John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness as to

taking steps on the subject. The civil authorities did not think it desirable to take steps."

On St. Patrick's Day, March 17, there was a parade of about 4,500 Irish Volunteers (1,817 of them armed) throughout the provinces. The Inspector-General of the R.I.C. reported :—

"There can be no doubt that the Irish Volunteer leaders are a pack of rebels who would proclaim their independence in the event of any favourable opportunity, but with their present resources and without substantial reinforcements it is difficult to imagine that they will make even a brief stand against a small body of troops. These observations, however, are made with reference to the provinces and not to the Dublin metropolitan area, which is the centre of the movement."

At the end of last March the Council of the Irish Volunteers issued a manifesto warning the public that the Volunteers "cannot submit to be disarmed, and that the raiding for arms and the attempted disarming of men, therefore, in the natural course of things can only be met by resistance and bloodshed." On April 7 very violent speeches were made at meetings of the Irish Volunteers, threats being used that persons attempting to disarm them would be "shot dead." The Chief Commissioner reported to the Under-Secretary, and Colonel Edgeworth-Johnstone wrote :—

"These recruiting meetings are a very undesirable development, and are, I think, causing both annoyance and uneasiness amongst loyal citizens. . . . The Sinn Féin party are gaining in numbers, in equipment, in discipline, and in confidence, and I think drastic action should be taken to limit their activities. The longer this is postponed the more difficult it will be to carry out."

This report reached the Under-Secretary on April 10. He wrote on it "Chief Secretary and the Lord-Lieutenant to see the Chief Commissioner's minute." On the 12th the Chief Secretary wrote upon it: "Requires careful consideration. Is it thought practicable to undertake a policy of disarmament, and, if so, within what limits, if any, can such a policy be circumscribed?" Upon the same day the Lord-Lieutenant wrote upon it: "This is a difficult point; could the disarming be satisfactorily effected?" No answer to the minute was returned to the R.I.C., and the file did not find its way back to the Inspector-General until May 24.

For some months before the rising a newspaper campaign was carried on suggesting that if an attempt were made by the Government to disarm the Irish Volunteers it could only arise from the deliberate intention of Englishmen to provoke disorder and bloodshed. There is no doubt that these articles were intended to intimidate the Irish Government and to prevent them from taking active repressive measures.

On April 18 news reached Dublin Castle that a ship had left Germany for Ireland on April 12, accompanied by two German submarines, but there was a caution as to its accuracy. The statement added that the ship was due to arrive on the 21st, and that a rising was timed for Easter Eve. On April 19 a special meeting of the Dublin Corporation was held at the Mansion House to discuss the police rate. Alderman Thomas Kelly stated that he had received that morning from the editor of *New*

Ireland the following circular from a man named Little, *New Ireland* Office, 13 Fleet Street, Dublin, April 16, 1916 :—

“Sir,—The gravity of the present situation in Ireland compels me to invite your serious attention to the enclosed. It is a copy of portion of a document recently addressed to, and on the files in, Dublin Castle. In view of the deliberate intention here revealed on the part of the Government to cause bloodshed in Ireland by an attack on the Irish Volunteers—a body formed openly in pre-war times—in a manner certain to provoke armed resistance, I appeal to you to use your influence, public and private, in whatever manner you may consider would best benefit this country. The cipher from which this document is copied does not indicate punctuation or capitals.

“The following precautionary measures have been sanctioned by the Irish Office on the recommendation of the General Officer Commanding the Forces in Ireland. All preparations will be made to put these measures in force immediately on receipt of an order issued from the Chief Secretary’s Office, Dublin Castle, and signed by the Under-Secretary and the General Officer Commanding the Forces in Ireland. First, the following persons to be placed under arrest: All members of the Sinn Fein National Council, the Central Executive Irish Sinn Fein Volunteers, General Council Irish Sinn Fein Volunteers, County Board Irish Sinn Fein Volunteers, Executive Committee National Volunteers, Caisde Gnota Committee Gaelic League. See list A 3 and 4 and supplementary list A 2. . . . Dublin Metropolitan Police and Royal Irish Constabulary forces in Dublin City will be confined to barracks under the direction of the Competent Military Authority. An order will be issued to inhabitants of city to remain in their houses until such time as the Competent Military Authority may otherwise direct or permit. Pickets chosen from units of Territorial Forces will be placed at all points marked on maps 3 and 4. Accompanying mounted patrols will continuously visit all points and report every hour. The following premises will be occupied by adequate forces, and all necessary measures used without need of reference to headquarters. First, premises known as Liberty Hall, Beresford Place ; No. 6 Harcourt Street, Sinn Fein Building ; No. 2 Dawson Street, Headquarters, Volunteers ; No. 12 d’Olier Street, *Nationality* Office ; No. 25 Rutland Square, Gaelic League Office ; 41 Rutland Square, Foresters’ Hall ; Sinn Fein Volunteer premises in city ; all National Volunteer premises in the city ; Trades Council premises, Canal Street ; Surrey House, Leinster Road, Rathmines. The following premises will be isolated, and all communications to or from prevented : Premises known as Archbishop’s House, Drumcondra, Mansion House, Dawson Street ; No. 40 Herbert Park ; Larkfield, Kimmage Road, Woodtown Park, Ballyboden ; Saint Enda’s College, Hermitage, Rathfarnham ; and in addition premises in list 5 D, see maps 3 and 4.”

Alderman Kelly, in continuing, said that the document was evidently genuine, and that he had done a public service in drawing attention to it, in order to prevent these military operations from being carried on in a city which he declared was under God the most peaceable in Europe. This document, say the Commissioners, was an entire fabrica-

tion. Copies of it found since the outbreak are shown by identification of type to have been printed at Liberty Hall, the headquarters of the Citizen Army. It was not known who was the author, or whether Mr. Little was in any way responsible. Many copies of this forged document were printed and distributed, and it was widely considered by the people to be genuine, and no doubt led to the belief by the members of the Irish Volunteers and Citizen Army that they would shortly be disarmed. This undoubtedly became one of the proximate causes of the outbreak.

On Saturday, April 22, the news of the capture of the German ship and of the arrest of a man believed to be Sir Roger Casement was published. The *Irish Volunteer* newspaper announced that day :—

“ Arrangements are now nearing completion in all the more important brigade areas for the holding of a very interesting series of manoeuvres at Easter. In some instances the arrangements contemplate a one or two day bivouac. As for Easter, the Dublin programme may well stand as a model for other areas.”

It is clear that the leaders of the movement expected the arrival of the ship, since emissaries of the Irish Volunteers were sent to meet it. The vessel, however, and Casement appear to have arrived sooner than was expected. On the news of the capture of the ship orders were given cancelling throughout all Ireland the Volunteer arrangements for the Sunday. On that day conferences were held at Dublin Castle, and it was eventually decided that the proper course was to arrest all the leaders of the movement, there being now clear evidence of their “ hostile association,” but it was agreed that first military preparations sufficient to overawe armed opposition should be secured. Early the next morning Mr. Birrell’s agreement to the proposed arrest and internment in England of the hostile leaders was asked for and obtained, but before any further effective steps could be taken the insurrection had broken out. The outbreak had been carefully planned beforehand. A pocket-book discovered upon one of the rebels who took part in the rising in Wexford contained a list of the places actually seized in Dublin when the outbreak occurred.

The Commissioners conclude their report with a tribute to the able and energetic services of their hon. secretary, Mr. Grimwood Mears.

-

RETROSPECT

OF

LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART IN 1916.

LITERATURE.

THE publication of new books during the year 1916 showed a considerable decline on the previous year, although in no way approaching to the general collapse which was prophesied at the beginning of the war by Mr. Edmund Gosse and others. It was indeed a matter of perpetual astonishment to notice how little the war appeared to affect the output of literature. The shock which had been given to publishing by the outbreak of war in August, 1914, had already begun to pass away before the end of that year, and throughout 1915 and 1916 no further set-back occurred in the issue of books in a normal if somewhat diminished stream. Throughout these years of war the public appeared at all times ready to spend money on the purchase of books. A steady demand continued, not only for fiction, but for all kinds of serious literature; and philosophic periodicals such as the *Hibbert Journal* and *Science Progress* tended rather to an increase than to a diminution of circulation. The difficulties of publishers arose, not from any slackness in the public demand for books, but from the disorganisation of the machinery of production and distribution consequent upon the withdrawal of men from the trade into military service and other work of national importance. Most of the large publishing houses were running on a staff which was barely sufficient for carrying out their ordinary business, and the problem which they had to face was less that of inducing the public to buy books than of getting books on the market and into the hands of those who wanted them.

It was mainly in consequence of these difficulties that in almost every department of publishing the number of books issued in 1916 fell short of that issued in 1915. The decline was least marked in the region of fiction. 1635 novels were published in 1916 as against 1646 in 1915. History, which in 1915 had shown an actual increase in the number of books published over that for 1914, continued to maintain a prominent position. Biographies and memoirs fell off somewhat. Poetry continued to be produced in considerable quantity. The slight effect of the war upon the output of literature is shown by the fact that upwards of 10,000 books were published during the year, the figure being very nearly what it was for 1911. If the quantity thus continued to

maintain a satisfactory level the same perhaps can scarcely be said of the quality. The average novel of 1916 seemed to be distinctly inferior to that of preceding years, although naturally there were a few works of remarkably high order. Among these may be mentioned especially "The Brook Kerith," by Mr. George Moore (T. Werner Laurie, Ltd.), and "Fondie," by Mr. Edward Booth (Duckworth & Co., Ltd.). But in serious as well as in light literature there seemed to be fewer books published of permanent importance than might have been hoped for. The effect of the war upon literature did not appear to be of a favourable character.

The new proposals announced at the end of the year for the institution of Universal National Service introduced a considerable element of doubt as to the position likely to be occupied by publishing during the remainder of the war. The resources and machinery of the trade had already been strained to the uttermost by the withdrawal of men, and it was felt that if further labour was to be taken from this important industry a drastic reduction in the output would have to be faced. The question thus arose as to the degree in which the publication of books might be regarded as an essential industry, and one therefore to receive special consideration when the transference of men to works of national importance was actually taken in hand. Among all the intellectual classes of the country there was only one opinion on this subject. We have referred at various places in the present ANNUAL REGISTER to the demand so constantly urged in the course of the year for the introduction of more scientific methods into the conduct of the war and into our industrial system at the end of the war. On all hands it was recognised that the efficiency of the nation depended upon its capacity for learning, that is to say, for acquiring and understanding the knowledge that was made available by new discoveries. New learning on a large scale can only be achieved through the medium of books. From the strictly utilitarian point of view, therefore, it was argued that the efficiency and continued vitality of the nation was at least as much dependent upon the quality and volume of its literary output as upon any other single industry. "Knowledge is power," and if this country was to secure victory over its enemies and to maintain economic and industrial supremacy over its rivals in the future, the first and most important condition was that of bringing the means of knowledge within the reach of all those who were in a position to profit by it.

There were many, however, who defended the essential position of publishing on still higher principles. They pointed out that the literature of any age or country constituted an exact index of the degree of civilisation in that age or country. Books are not only the agency through which knowledge is obtained; they are also the means to a still wider type of education. They broaden the mind and cultivate the spirit of humanity and toleration which war is so apt to suppress. They induce a solidity and seriousness of outlook which makes for more strength of character and efficiency in all departments of practical life. From the point of view of civilisation as well as from the national point of view, it was argued that any enlightened Government, and more especially any Government which was fighting for the principles of humanity and freedom, must rank the publication of books as a cardinal

feature in the healthy life of the nation. "The pen is mightier than the sword," and it was held that in any far-sighted view of the situation the welfare of the people depended at least as much upon the progress of knowledge through the medium of books accessible to all, as upon the issue of particular battles or even of wars.

Nor was this view sustained only among the academic sections of the population. Sir Douglas Haig himself sent a message from France towards the end of November on the inauguration of the publishers' "Book-Fortnight," in the course of which he said that "any movement to increase the circulation of books has my whole-hearted support." He commented on the extraordinary value of books to the men in the trenches and billets and in hospitals, and he expressed the hope that those at home would buy books very freely and in increasing numbers, and having read them pass them on as freely for circulation among the troops. In this matter therefore military opinion may be regarded as in complete harmony with the opinion of those who were concerned more with the ultimate welfare and efficiency of the country. Books constituted one of the few remaining forms of recreation not only to the soldiers in the Army but to the bulk of the civilian population, at a time when so many of their other normal recreations had been suppressed. In view of these considerations the hope was confidently entertained that the unique position of publishing in the life of a nation could not fail to obtain its proper recognition from any Government which claimed to be fighting for civilisation and enlightenment.

The following is an account of some of the leading books published during the year :—

I. GENERAL LITERATURE.

British Birds, written and illustrated by A. Thorburn, F.Z.S. (Longmans, Green & Co.). The completion of this monumental work on British Birds is one of the most important events of publishing during the year. In the *ANNUAL REGISTER* of 1915 we reviewed the two first volumes. The third volume appeared in the Spring, and the fourth and final volume in the Autumn of 1916. The coloured plates, which constitute the fundamental interest of the book, come entirely up to the remarkable level of achievement attained in the two first volumes. Volume iii. includes the herons and storks, the geese, swans and ducks, the game birds, and the rails and crakes, while the frontispiece is given up to the Great Bustard. The fourth volume includes the whole of the waders, terns, gulls, and sea-birds, the frontispiece containing singularly beautiful delineations of the commoner terns of this country. The system pursued in these two later volumes is identical with that of the earlier; that is to say, birds that are closely related are placed in conjunction on one plate, so that their differences are easily discernible. The great majority of the birds are obviously drawn from life; a few only have, of necessity, been taken at second-hand. Conspicuous among these is the great auk which, unfortunately, no artist will ever again be able to sketch from life.

This great work has steadily advanced in public popularity since the issue of the first two volumes in 1915. Its sale, we believe, has not been

less than would have been expected even in a normal year of peace, and the earlier volumes had to be reprinted before the later volumes were published. Considerable comment was raised by the fact that, notwithstanding the severe losses inflicted by the war upon many classes of the community, a work such as this priced at six guineas should continue to sell in large numbers. It has to be observed, however, that this figure, though large in itself for a book, is singularly small in view of the exceedingly high expenses of production.

Thorburn's "British Birds" is now, and is likely to remain for a long time to come, the standard work from the point of view of coloured illustrations. The letterpress which accompanies the plates does not aspire to contain anything fresh or indeed to be more than merely explanatory and subsidiary to the plates. Such criticism as has been directed against this work (and there has been scarcely any) has been levelled mainly at the exiguousness of the letterpress, which certainly is inadequate to convey any detailed account of the appearance or habits of the birds. From many points of view, however, this is an advantage rather than otherwise, for it reduces the bulk of the work; and moreover, detailed notes of the natural history of each bird would be somewhat out of place in a work that is concerned only with pictorial representation. One point, however, might perhaps have been considered more than it has. The ordinary purchaser of this book is probably more interested in the identification of the birds he comes across than in any erudite record of their classification or geographical distribution. To such a reader it is of great importance to be informed of the distinctive signs by which in practice closely related birds can be recognised from one another. These signs often have no sort of biological or scientific interest. We can always tell the cole-tit from the great-tit by the white mark at the back of his neck; we can tell the ring-dove from the rock-dove by the white band across his wings. Thus for the average reader small and unimportant marks of identification are perhaps of greater interest than the details which would be demanded by a professional ornithologist. Thus, in the present volumes a note might have been inserted in the letterpress to indicate the methods of distinguishing the stock-dove from the rock-dove, and the herring-gull from the common gull,—details which would greatly add to the utility of the book for the average uninformed observer. This, however, is but a small point. The outstanding fact of this book is, as we said last year, that it is a work less of the year than of the century. During recent years many excellent and expensive works of illustration of British birds have come into fashion. All these are now definitely superseded by Thorburn. It is unlikely that there will be any further competition in this sphere for many years to come, and it is still more unlikely that such competition would have any chance of success.

A new history of modern Germany is being written by Sir Adolphus William Ward under the title **Germany: 1815-1890** (Cambridge University Press); and during the year the first volume of this work, dealing with the period 1815-1852, was published. The book is one of the "Cambridge Historical Series". The great majority of the books on Germany which have been published in England during the last three years have been written with the object of proving a special thesis—a thesis not pre-

cisely complimentary to the German nation ; but the present work is to be placed in a totally different category. This is real history, for Sir A. W. Ward is of course a real historian. This first volume covers the greater part of the life of that extraordinary contrivance, the old German Confederation, which, it will be remembered, existed (with a revolutionary interval) from the fall of Napoleon to the definite split between Austria and Prussia in 1866. The period reviewed is a less dramatic one than that which immediately followed, but nevertheless it is interesting from several points of view. Even an impartial record such as this leaves an impression, not of course of any Satanic wickedness inherent in German human nature, but of certain curious failings in German mentality. The old Confederation was one of the most irrational and indefensible political organisms ever devised in Europe. The remarkable point is that it should have been tolerated in the days of our grandfathers by one of the greatest nations in the world. It is strange that the Germans, whose high mental abilities in some directions nobody denies, who lead the world in technology and excel in some of the higher branches of science (which is not the same thing as technology) and in some branches of philosophy, should nevertheless be a backward people, nay, a positively stupid people, in politics. The old Confederation was a federation which certain states were partly within and partly without. This was true of Austria and of Prussia, and a portion of Holland was also within the Confederation. This was as though half Canada were included in the British Empire and the other half excluded. The Constitution, if such it could be called, was full of anomalies of an equally extraordinary character. Thus in the Federal Diet there was no attempt to give the states representation in proportion to their respective populations. There is no doubt that the Germans were at this time, and still are, generations behind the so-called Anglo-Saxon peoples in political matters. The most interesting chapter in the book is that dealing with the great revolutionary attempt of 1848 to realise the ideal of a united Liberal Democratic Germany—an attempt which came very near to success. The history of that movement always makes somewhat pathetic reading.

Treitschke's History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century, with appendixes, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul, with an introduction by Harbutt Dawson. Vol. II. (London : Jarrold & Sons, Ltd. G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.). Treitschke's second volume of the *History of Germany* in the Nineteenth Century treats chiefly of the German Federation, the Belgian Campaign, the reconstruction of Prussia and the South German Constitutional Struggle. The German Federation was not exactly the work of the reigning Princes, it was, says Mr. Dawson in his preface, "the idea of Metternich . . . who presided over the Congress and bent it to his will, concerned only to divide the States, so that Austria might rule them." The Congress of Vienna had introduced many changes in the map of Germany ; Prussia's boundaries had been readjusted, but she had not gained much territory. She desired to absorb the whole of Saxony, but owing to the strong opposition of Austria, France, and England her project was defeated. Amidst these struggles, says Treitschke, "the re-establishment of the Prussian Monarchy was effected" ; but "the outcome of the Viennese negotiations was a

partial defeat for Prussian policy, for neither upon the Rhine, nor in Saxony, nor yet upon the Polish frontier, had Prussia completely gained her ends." Treitschke's account of the defeat of Napoleon at Belle Alliance—he will not name the historic spot Waterloo—is given in interesting detail so far as the German army is concerned. Treitschke blames Wellington bitterly for not keeping his word to reinforce Blücher with 2,000 men at Quatre Bras; and he subsequently regrets his lenity to the French after their great defeat; yet he pays a fine tribute to his military capacity. "Wellington," he says, "is numbered among those rare men who, without creative genius, almost without talent, simply by force of character, by the power of will and of self-command, climb to the heights of historic fame."

After the collapse of the "Crowned Plebeian," everywhere, says Treitschke, "there was an awakening of Spirit . . . the fertility of the new generation of men of learning seemed inexhaustible." Literature, art, and science advanced with giant strides, propelled by the genius of such men as Goethe, Schinkel, and von Humbolt. In addition to their more erudite works, the brothers Grimm delighted the world with their fairy tales; as did the musicians Gluck, Haydn, and Mozart by their works of melody. The religious spirit was also awakened; "the Germans at length recognised how intimately their entire civilisation was linked with Christianity. . . . Schleirmacher educated a new school of theologians . . . to keep pace with the young scientific life of the nation." The Catholic Church, like the Protestant, was afflicted with the extravagance of "crude superstition." Nevertheless, at this juncture she gained such converts as Schlosser, Stolberg, and Schegal. The Bundestag began stormily, says Treitschke, "it almost seemed as if the history of the Germanic Federation was to begin with a civil war," and during the first two years of its existence it "succeeded in bringing to fruition only one moderately useful law." In his chapter on the reconstruction of the Prussian States, Treitschke points out that "no other country of those days numbered among its officials such a crowd of exceptional men." In spite of friction within the government "the work of reorganising the administration made steady and secure progress." The reorganising of what had formerly been Saxon territory was by far the greatest difficulty. This chapter goes on to deal at length with legal and fiscal reforms. With regard to Free Trade, Treitschke remarks, that "the great free trade movement of our century was initiated not in England, but in Prussia." The forming of the South German Constitutions, Wurtemberg, Bavaria, Nassau, and Hesse Darmstadt, conclude the second volume.

Germany's Economic Position, and England's Commercial and Industrial Policy after the War, by G. B. Dibblee (published for the Central Committee for National Patriotic Organisations, by William Heinemann). This admirable volume is full of information, essential to anyone who wishes to understand the relative economic positions of England and Germany before and after the war. The author deals firstly with the main factors at work in German industrial expansion, and then with their methods of financing industry. The German Government, and the German character which produced it, are discussed

in a luminous and interesting manner. Mr. Dibblee then goes on to consider the question of free trade or tariffs; and expresses the opinion that after the war we shall have a tariff, though probably not a Protectionist one. As regards the Paris Economic Conference, Mr. Dibblee perceives no great results flowing from it; and he does not think that any of the Resolutions passed on the measures to be taken after the war are likely to prove of much value. From external measures of defence, he passes to internal measures of defence, and suggests a system of licenses for carrying on trade in various branches. Finally he deals with the subject of Labour Unrest. On all these topics Mr. Dibblee writes with singular lucidity and freedom from prepossessions. Whether the reader agrees or disagrees with the practical conclusions put forward, he will at any rate feel that he has learned much by the perusal of this volume.

Nationality as a Factor in Modern History, by J. Holland Rose, Litt.D. (Rivingtons). In a series of ten admirable lectures, Mr. J. Holland Rose discusses "the varied manifestations of Nationality among the chief European peoples. It was reserved for Rousseau," he says, "to set forth the national idea with a force and cogency which opened up a new era both in thought and deed. The Swiss thinker not only gave birth to the idea of the Nation, but he endowed it with the strength of an infant Hercules." In France, Mr. Rose points out, Jeanne d'Arc is the first exponent of the national idea, which was realised in 1790. Germany was greatly stirred by the French Revolution; in that country the idea of a nation was set forth by Schiller in his "Wilhelm Tell," which work appears later to have considerably influenced Fichte's "Addresses to the German Nation." When, after the popular outbreaks in 1848-49, Frederick William IV. promised that henceforth Prussia would merge herself in Germany, "the triumph over the Prussian State seemed assured," but when the Union of Germany was achieved in 1870-71 "it was through the House of Hohenzollern and the Prussian State." Mr. Rose says that the first sign of the new spirit was an essay on "Realpolitik" by Rochau, setting forth the new political materialism, "The State is Power." Treitschke's eager nationalism led him to advise the absorption of the lesser German States by Prussia, including his own native Saxony; they would, he said, soon be greatly benefited by her rule: an "Einheitsstaat" was required. Bismarck cordially agreed with his theory; Prussia was to take the lead in the United States, and what Prussia required for military reasons, she was to have *coûte que coûte*.

In the "Spanish National Rising" Mr. Rose draws attention to the differences between the German and Spanish national movements. Especially interesting is his chapter on the "Awakening of the Slavs," and its sequel, "Nationalism since 1885." In regard to the Italian national struggle, "Mazzini," Mr. Rose writes, "appealed in burning words to the youth of Italy to raise the red, white, and green flag . . . for national unity." In mapping out the boundaries of the future Italian State, Mr. Rose points out "that it is worthy of note that Mazzini did not claim for Italy the Dalmatian coast-line which he knew to be Slavonic, not Italian." Though Mazzini's schemes failed, it is mainly

partial defeat for Prussian policy, for neither upon the Rhine, nor in Saxony, nor yet upon the Polish frontier, had Prussia completely gained her ends." Treitschke's account of the defeat of Napoleon at Belle Alliance—he will not name the historic spot Waterloo—is given in interesting detail so far as the German army is concerned. Treitschke blames Wellington bitterly for not keeping his word to reinforce Blücher with 2,000 men at Quatre Bras; and he subsequently regrets his lenity to the French after their great defeat; yet he pays a fine tribute to his military capacity. "Wellington," he says, "is numbered among those rare men who, without creative genius, almost without talent, simply by force of character, by the power of will and of self-command, climb to the heights of historic fame."

After the collapse of the "Crowned Plebeian," everywhere, says Treitschke, "there was an awakening of Spirit . . . the fertility of the new generation of men of learning seemed inexhaustible." Literature, art, and science advanced with giant strides, propelled by the genius of such men as Goethe, Schinkel, and von Humbolt. In addition to their more erudite works, the brothers Grimm delighted the world with their fairy tales; as did the musicians Gluck, Haydn, and Mozart by their works of melody. The religious spirit was also awakened; "the Germans at length recognised how intimately their entire civilisation was linked with Christianity. . . . Schleirmacher educated a new school of theologians . . . to keep pace with the young scientific life of the nation." The Catholic Church, like the Protestant, was afflicted with the extravagance of "crude superstition." Nevertheless, at this juncture she gained such converts as Schlosser, Stolberg, and Schegal. The Bundestag began stormily, says Treitschke, "it almost seemed as if the history of the Germanic Federation was to begin with a civil war," and during the first two years of its existence it "succeeded in bringing to fruition only one moderately useful law." In his chapter on the reconstruction of the Prussian States, Treitschke points out that "no other country of those days numbered among its officials such a crowd of exceptional men." In spite of friction within the government "the work of reorganising the administration made steady and secure progress." The reorganising of what had formerly been Saxon territory was by far the greatest difficulty. This chapter goes on to deal at length with legal and fiscal reforms. With regard to Free Trade, Treitschke remarks, that "the great free trade movement of our century was initiated not in England, but in Prussia." The forming of the South German Constitutions, Wurtemberg, Bavaria, Nassau, and Hesse Darmstadt, conclude the second volume.

Germany's Economic Position, and England's Commercial and Industrial Policy after the War, by G. B. Dibblee (published for the Central Committee for National Patriotic Organisations, by William Heinemann). This admirable volume is full of information, essential to anyone who wishes to understand the relative economic positions of England and Germany before and after the war. The author deals firstly with the main factors at work in German industrial expansion, and then with their methods of financing industry. The German Government, and the German character which produced it, are discussed

in a luminous and interesting manner. Mr. Dibblee then goes on to consider the question of free trade or tariffs; and expresses the opinion that after the war we shall have a tariff, though probably not a Protectionist one. As regards the Paris Economic Conference, Mr. Dibblee perceives no great results flowing from it; and he does not think that any of the Resolutions passed on the measures to be taken after the war are likely to prove of much value. From external measures of defence, he passes to internal measures of defence, and suggests a system of licenses for carrying on trade in various branches. Finally he deals with the subject of Labour Unrest. On all these topics Mr. Dibblee writes with singular lucidity and freedom from prepossessions. Whether the reader agrees or disagrees with the practical conclusions put forward, he will at any rate feel that he has learned much by the perusal of this volume.

Nationality as a Factor in Modern History, by J. Holland Rose, Litt.D. (Rivingtons). In a series of ten admirable lectures, Mr. J. Holland Rose discusses "the varied manifestations of Nationality among the chief European peoples. It was reserved for Rousseau," he says, "to set forth the national idea with a force and cogency which opened up a new era both in thought and deed. The Swiss thinker not only gave birth to the idea of the Nation, but he endowed it with the strength of an infant Hercules." In France, Mr. Rose points out, Jeanne d'Arc is the first exponent of the national idea, which was realised in 1790. Germany was greatly stirred by the French Revolution; in that country the idea of a nation was set forth by Schiller in his "Wilhelm Tell," which work appears later to have considerably influenced Fichte's "Addresses to the German Nation." When, after the popular outbreaks in 1848-49, Frederick William IV. promised that henceforth Prussia would merge herself in Germany, "the triumph over the Prussian State seemed assured," but when the Union of Germany was achieved in 1870-71 "it was through the House of Hohenzollern and the Prussian State." Mr. Rose says that the first sign of the new spirit was an essay on "Realpolitik" by Rochau, setting forth the new political materialism, "The State is Power." Treitschke's eager nationalism led him to advise the absorption of the lesser German States by Prussia, including his own native Saxony; they would, he said, soon be greatly benefited by her rule: an "Einheitsstaat" was required. Bismarck cordially agreed with his theory; Prussia was to take the lead in the United States, and what Prussia required for military reasons, she was to have *coûte que coûte*.

In the "Spanish National Rising" Mr. Rose draws attention to the differences between the German and Spanish national movements. Especially interesting is his chapter on the "Awakening of the Slavs," and its sequel, "Nationalism since 1885." In regard to the Italian national struggle, "Mazzini," Mr. Rose writes, "appealed in burning words to the youth of Italy to raise the red, white, and green flag . . . for national unity." In mapping out the boundaries of the future Italian State, Mr. Rose points out "that it is worthy of note that Mazzini did not claim for Italy the Dalmatian coast-line which he knew to be Slavonic, not Italian." Though Mazzini's schemes failed, it is mainly

the "faith and enthusiasm" which he kindled that enabled Cavour and Victor Emmanuel to form the Italy of to-day.

The Problem of the Commonwealth, by L. Curtis (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.), deals with a question which is of only less importance to Englishmen than the European settlement itself. The Commonwealth of the title is that strange congeries of states which we call the British Empire, and the problem is the political relationship of the different parts to one another. The glaring anomaly which the author condemns, and which no political thinker fails to appreciate, is the difference of status between the United Kingdom on the one hand and the four "Dominions" on the other. The Parliament and Government of the United Kingdom are also the Imperial Parliament and Imperial Government in as much as they alone control and direct foreign policy, whereas the Canadian and Australian Parliaments have no voice in the control of foreign affairs. The book is divided into two parts, the first being styled "What the Problem Is" and the second "The Conditions of its Solution." Mr. Curtis examines various schemes for getting rid of this anomaly, which by common consent cannot be allowed to continue after the war, and he condemns as impracticable the idea of "an in and out" arrangement by which Dominion representatives were sent either to the British Parliament or to the British executive, to join in deliberations which concerned the Empire as a whole, but taking no part in matters which concerned the United Kingdom only. The author advocates a fully developed scheme of imperial federation; he would reduce the functions of the British Parliament to those of a Dominion legislature, and would at the same time institute a truly Imperial Parliament, with an Imperial Government responsible to it, this Imperial Parliament being representative of the electorates of the British Isles and of the four great self-governing Dominions. The Imperial Parliament would control foreign policy, Imperial defence, federal finance, and also,—this is a point to be noted,—the government of the great dependencies, India and the Crown Colonies. Mr. Curtis considers the alternative policy of leaving the control of the dependencies in the hands of the Government of the United Kingdom, but dismisses that idea as unworkable. Thus, under this scheme, the Foreign Office, the Admiralty, the War Office, the India Office, the Colonial Office, and an Imperial Treasury, would be responsible to the new Imperial Parliament. It will be seen that the book is one that should be studied by all thoughtful citizens of all the Britains.

Abraham Lincoln, by Lord Charnwood (Constable & Co., Ltd.). Lord Charnwood's book, with a chronological table and map, is a valuable addition to the excellent series "Makers of the Nineteenth Century." Lord Charnwood gives a very interesting sketch of Lincoln's youth, his poverty and his struggles to educate himself when he was "a young labouring man with hardly any schooling, naturally and incurably uncouth." He points out that at first Lincoln "had remained coldly aloof from the Abolitionist propaganda when Herndon and other friends tried to interest him in it, feeling, it seems, that agitation in the Free States against laws which existed constitutionally in the Slave States was not only futile but improper." But there is no doubt that from an early

period of his political career, the abolition of the slave trade had become an *idée fixe*. "The battle of freedom," he said, is to be fought out on principle. Slavery is a violation of eternal right. And when eventually the forcing of this principle caused the Southern States to rebel, he was determined at all costs to maintain the unity of the States. The story of Lincoln's life, therefore, is practically a history of the great civil war which occupied nearly the whole period of his Presidency, the events of which Lord Charnwood relates with great facility and interest.

At the War, by Lord Northcliffe (Hodder & Stoughton). This book is published for the Joint War Committee of the British Red Cross Society, and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem in England; the profits arising from it passing to the joint committee of those Societies. Lord Northcliffe gives vivid impressionist accounts of the scenes which he witnessed during his visits to the various theatres of war. Among these notably are records of his impressions of Sir Douglas Haig, Joffre, and Cadorna. A singularly interesting account is given of some of the work of the Royal Army Medical Corps, by which Lord Northcliffe was specially struck. He was able to watch parts of the battle of Verdun; and gives a gruesome illustration of the horrors of modern warfare. He refers to "the sufferings of the wounded lying out through the long nights of icy wind in the No-Man's Land between the lines." . . . "It is one of the most gruesome facts in the history of the War that the French, peering through the moonlight at what they thought to be stealthily crawling Germans, found them to be wounded men frozen to death." Lord Northcliffe gives a particularly full account of the Italian fighting and the capture of Gorizia. Finally he records his impressions while travelling through neutral countries—Switzerland and Spain. He draws attention to the immense army of German agents in Spain; but was favourably impressed by the attitude of the Swiss, even in German Switzerland, towards the Allies. In these neutral countries he was struck by "the great space which youth occupies in the social landscape". . . "but it is a singular fact that, despite the presence of young men, the atmosphere of neutrality is depressing. When passports have been examined at the French Frontier stations, and the familiar light blue uniforms once more preponderate, one will breathe again. In these great days the breath of war is the breath of life, and the spirit of sacrifice is the spirit of regeneration."

Italy in the War, by Sidney Low, with thirty-two illustrations and three maps (Longmans, Green, & Co.). One of the most interesting war books which has appeared is undoubtedly Mr. Sidney Low's "Italy in the War." Mr. Low points out the enormous geographical difficulties by which the Italians were beset, and which they conquered at the outset; they were not daunted by the "immense natural rampart of the Rhaetian and Tyrolean Alps, the Dolomites, the Carnia, the Julian, and Dinaric ranges," which places their country "at the mercy of the invader so long as it is in the hands of an armed and alien Power"; but in spite of these strategic disadvantages, "the Italian chief of the Staff had no intention of confining himself to the defensive," and his prompt action, together with the magnificent work of his Alpine and other mountain troops, saved the country from the possible fate

of Belgium. "Cadorna," says Mr. Low, "never lost sight of his main objective, which was the road to Trieste;" and Mr. Low reminds us that "Italy, alone among the Entente Powers, instead of having to give ground to the invader, began the war by seizing certain valuable slices of the hostile soil" which up to date she has been able to keep. The taking of the Gorizia *place d'armes* is graphically told. It was "one of the most important and violent onslaughts on fortified positions that the European War has yet seen," but the battle opened the road to Trieste. The change of climate which the Italian troops had to endure was severe; "down on the Carso," says Mr. Low, "the fighting is done under a sun like that of Africa," a vast change from the Alpine snows. The chapter on the Trentino battles, and the gradual retreat of the Italians from their advanced positions, before their counter-attack, is intensely interesting. Mr. Low's vivid descriptions of the Italian war area are delightful, for he has trodden those precipitous paths and glaciers and writes as one who knows. Not the least interesting chapter in the book is the political one, entitled "Why Italy is Fighting."

Tales of the Great War, by Henry Newbolt (Longmans, Green & Co.). Sir Henry Newbolt's "Tales of the Great War" may have been written for boys, but it will be read by adults with equal interest and pleasure. It begins with the adventures of a subaltern, a boy "straight from school and Oxford," who is attached to the 2nd Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry just after the retreat from Mons, and tells of his experiences at the now famous Hill 60, and at the destruction of Ypres. The next two chapters treat of naval matters including the battles of Coronel and the Falklands. Sir Henry Newbolt relates the romantic career of the *Emden* and her final defeat by the Australians, with vivid interest. In the "Story of a General" he points out the wonderful generalship of Sir Horace Smith-Dorrien and the confidence with which he inspired his men; and he relates with many exciting incidents, how he saved an Army, and the part he played in the battles of the Marne, and Aisne, and in the struggle for Calais. Sir Henry Newbolt says of Sir Horace that he is a man who "even if he is called upon to face some awful moment on which great issues hang, he will see clearly, decide unhesitatingly, and play to win." Perhaps the most interesting chapter in the book is the one on "War in the Air," which, besides being very instructive, gives a most interesting account of the work done by our air-men, anti-aircraft guns, etc., and includes stories of the Zeppelin raids in England. The volume ends with a thrilling account of the battle of Jutland. The book is admirably illustrated with seven coloured plates and thirty-two illustrations in black-and-white by Norman Wilkinson and Christopher Clark.

The European Anarchy, by G. Lowes Dickinson (Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.). This book is selected as representative of a small school of thought which found extremely little following in the country, although it was understood to prevail in small circles at some of the Universities. The general purport of Mr. Lowes Dickinson's argument is that the present calamitous state of affairs is due to the general traditions of European Policy rather than to the moral obliquity of any single nation. He admits indeed that the Central Powers are to blame for the immediate out-

break of the war, but he holds that all the European nations together were responsible for the state of affairs which rendered such an outbreak possible. He does not attempt to palliate the crime of Austria in declaring war upon Serbia in July, 1914, and he passes a very proper censure upon Germany for their backing of Austria at that time. Nevertheless he endeavours to show that there is no foundation for the belief that Germany for a long period of years had been awaiting a favourable opportunity for precipitating a war of conquest and aggression. He tries to show that what he calls the "European Anarchy" is characterised by universal distrust among the nations of Europe, and he cites diplomatic documents to prove that Germany was genuinely nervous of an attack by neighbouring countries, and in fact that the war was animated only by what she believed to be necessary for her future security and defence.

Mr. Lowes Dickinson is too distinguished a scholar to be bracketed with the class of propaganda of the Union of Democratic Control. However much we may disagree with his views, we are bound to confess that they are put forward in a philosophical spirit and are entitled at least to our respect. We may indeed almost make the criticism that they are too philosophical. The origin of all crime, if traced back far enough, may be reduced to psychological factors which arise in great part from social conditions and environment. In dealing with human nature, psychological explanations are always deeper than the merely logical; and if we push our analysis sufficiently far, we arrive in time at the French proverb "*Savoir tout c'est pardonner tout.*" But it must be observed that this line of reasoning would justify all crime and wrongdoing among men, and in fact that in practical life we have to approach the subject not from the standpoint of pure philosophy but from that of ethics.

Mr. Lowes Dickinson deals with the whole subject from an altogether different plane than that which forms the basis of practical life; and before we can accept the views which he puts forward, a complete revolution would be required in all our existing modes of thought. We may indeed go so far as to doubt whether Mr. Lowes Dickinson's conclusions flow logically from his philosophical premises. He proposes to cure the European Anarchy by setting up a National Tribunal which should enforce justice between nations as it is already enforced amongst individuals in any one nation. If such a scheme were possible, few people could doubt its desirability; but if, as seems to be the case, wars originate in the passions rather than in the reason of mankind, it would seem doubtful whether a Tribunal which appealed only to logic and reason would be competent to restrain the outburst of those human instincts which are far more powerful and deeper than the merely intellectual. What would seem to be needed, would be an altogether different orientation of popular feeling, and that if it can be achieved at all can certainly not be achieved by simple insistence on the economic futility of war. Probably it cannot be achieved at all, otherwise than by the slow growth of sentiments harmonious to civilisation. While, therefore, we cannot agree with Mr. Lowes Dickinson's doctrines, yet we are bound to recognise they are put forward with great

sincerity, and do even assist towards a deeper comprehension of the causes which underlie the present recrudescence of barbarism.

Essays in War-Time, by Havelock Ellis (Constable & Co., Ltd.). These essays deal mainly with questions of declining birth-rate, eugenics, war, and other fundamental problems of social life. The earlier essays are largely concerned with philosophic questions about warfare in general; but as the book proceeds the subject of war dies out, and we are introduced to other questions of more omnipresent importance. Mr. Havelock Ellis writes in a truly philosophical spirit; a circumstance that must be admitted, although we may not infrequently disagree with his conclusions. Thus when he regards democracy as immediately opposed to militarism, he omits to point out that the period of greatest militarism in modern Europe is precisely coincident with the period of most advanced democracy; nor does he offer any explanation as to why the most terrible war in history should be that which is fought by democracies, rather than by kings. Perhaps the doctrine most persistently urged in this book is that of the advantage of a low birth-rate; nor has Mr. Ellis any difficulty in showing a connexion between high states of civilisation and a low birth-rate. His natural instincts are opposed to war, and one interesting essay is devoted to the thesis that wars are declining in frequency, though not in ferocity. He continually urges the necessity for some action in the direction of Eugenics; and he makes an excellent attempt to answer some of the arguments of the opponents of Eugenics—especially the argument that genius is commonly allied to some form of nervous degeneracy, which might be stamped out by eugenic efforts. This argument is met by going over large numbers of instances of genius, and showing that in fact they are rarely or never associated with the kind of degeneracy which Eugenics aims at rooting-up. On all such questions as this, and the control of births generally, the effects of action may be so vast and abiding, that it is of the highest importance to know, before taking action, exactly what the result of the action will be. Action of such great importance can only be based upon knowledge of a high order of certainty. Whether or not Mr. Ellis is premature in calling for action, there is no doubt that his writings are of real value in promoting the knowledge which seems required.

Enseignements Psychologiques de la Guerre Européenne, by Dr. Gustave le Bon (Paris: Flammarion). In this work M. le Bon deals with the deeper causes of the war. He denies that the present state of affairs is due in any way to logic or to reason, and he seeks the true origins of the war in psychological factors. He is thus led to set aside many of the views commonly held as to the motives which led Germany to break up the peace of Europe. Especially, he denies that the invasion of neighbouring territories was in any way due to the pressure of a rapidly increasing population. He points out, on the contrary, that the extraordinary increase of German industry during the last quarter of a century has been far more than sufficient to absorb the surplus of the increasing population. It is true that the ultimate causes of the war are certainly psychological rather than logical or rational; and the emphasis which M. le Bon lays upon this truth is perhaps the most valuable feature of his book. Among the other subjects with which he

deals are the evolution of modern Germany, the immediate as well as the remote causes of the war, the psychological forces at work during battles, and also the psychological foundations of the German methods of war. He confidently anticipates a complete victory for the Allies, though he believes that the end of the war will come not through the military operations but by the economic failure of the Central Powers. Finally, he urges upon his countrymen the necessity of continuing the fight to the bitter end: "To win or die, but never to yield. Nothing can resist a strong and continuous will, neither nature nor man nor fate itself. I have said this already over and over again, and I now repeat it once more."

The Main Illusions of Pacifism, by G. G. Coulton (Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes), is described by the author as a criticism of Mr. Norman Angell and of the Union of Democratic Control. The style and character of the book are journalistic rather than literary, and the author makes a special attack upon Mr. Norman Angell. The second and smaller part of the book, which is directed against the Union of Democratic Control, is written in a somewhat milder tone. The author's own position on the questions of Peace and War is, he tells us, intermediate between those of Pacifism and what he calls Bernhardism respectively, and he would avoid either of these extremes, by instituting compulsory service in a democratic citizen army, after the model of the Swiss Army. The book is, however, not so much a connected development of a definite thesis, as a series of miscellaneous criticisms of the theories put forward by other writers.

Aristodemocracy. From the Great War back to Moses, Christ, and Plato. An Essay, with Appendixes, by Sir Charles Waldstein, M.A., Litt.D.; M.A., L.H.D., Col. Univ., New York; Ph.D., Heidelberg; Hon. Litt., Trin. Coll., Dublin (John Murray). Sir Charles Waldstein's essay, "Aristodemocracy," is a book which should be read by everybody. It is a protest against war as the arch-enemy of humanity; but Sir Charles wishes it to be clearly understood that while hating war and loving peace, he considers it "not only right but our sacred duty to fight German militarism with all the means of fair warfare which human ingenuity can devise and human courage can bring into fight." He considers that the United States have lost "perhaps the greatest opportunity in history to effect the cause of highest good . . . and has confirmed the divorce between right and might for years to come." The object of this essay is, he says, to show that in the "absence of ideals and of religious faith, truly expressive of our best thoughts and of the civilised conditions of modern life, is to be found the real cause of this one sudden and universal crisis in European history." Sir Charles gives an interesting sketch of the older German Kultur as it was up to the death of the late Emperor Frederick. Treitschke, he says, was "one of the many who, since 1870, have consciously endeavoured to undermine the highest Germanic spirit of philosophy and thoroughness in science, of purity in ideal strivings—the real Kultur, which with its army of scholars and students, Germany gave to the world." The writings of such men as Treitschke, Nietzsche and Bernhardt have done much to influence the morals of

modern Germany, and Sir Charles maintains "that of all the great capitals in the world . . . Berlin is the most patently and crassly depraved, and this depravity is admittedly organised and recognisable." Sir Charles Waldstein suggests that a cure for war would be an International Court to whose judicial enactments the world should conform, and he adds that it would be "more effective, as well as more economical," that there should be also international armies and armaments towards which each State, *pro rata*, should contribute its share, and thus enforce the ruling of the National Court, and he points out that history has proved the truth of the aphorism "no right without might." Sir Charles insists that the State should undertake the moral education of the young and also of the adult population. "The most crying need before us," he says, "is the clear recognition of such an expression of the moral consciousness of the age, and, without any interference with the established religious creeds and their practices as the expression of religious life, to provide for first, such an expression of our moral requirements, and secondly, for the effective dissemination of contemporary ethics throughout all layers of human society." Part IV. of the book gives an "Outline of the Principles of Contemporary Ethics," and even by itself would form an excellent work to place in the hands of seekers after pure ideals.

Christianity and Politics, by W. Cunningham, D.D., Archdeacon of Ely (John Murray), is a book on a subject which is of topical interest owing to the striking failure of Christian Europe to arrive at a condition of brotherhood. The book is a revised reprint of the Lowell Lectures, delivered in the autumn of 1914, and these lectures as originally delivered were intended to deal mainly with questions of domestic politics; but probably most readers will turn first to an appendix which has been added on the "Attitude of the Church towards War." This appendix is largely an historical thesis, and is mainly concerned with controverting what is called the Quaker view of the relations between Christianity and War. The author is strongly opposed to the position of "Conscientious Objectors." He adduces evidence to show that the refusal of many of the Early Christians to serve in the Imperial Army was not due to any general and doctrinal disapproval of all war as such, but to objections to taking the Pagan oaths which soldiers were required to swear, and to the Pagan rites by which a military life was then surrounded. Moreover, the author affirms that some Early Christians actually did serve in the Roman armies. The body of the book expounds the different opinions held by different denominations of Christians—Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Independents, and others—on the political duties of a Christian man. In reference to the work of the greatest Christian Church, the author shows that when all Western Europe possessed a certain religious unity, centred in the Roman Pontiff, national animosities were in some respects less acrimonious and less chaotic than they have become since the Reformation, which coincided with the rise of the cult of national independence. In reference to the political aspects of the English Reformation, Dr. Cunningham states that it was due in part to commercial ambitions, the English deeply resenting the sanction given by

the Papacy to the scheme by which Spain and Portugal, then the leading maritime Powers, possessed colonising and trading monopolies over huge regions of the newly discovered continents.

Epidemics Resulting from Wars, by Dr. Friedrich Prinzing. Edited by Harald Westergaard, Professor of Political Science in the University of Copenhagen (Clarendon Press). In a prefatory note, Mr. John Clark explains that the Division of Economics and History of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is organised to "promote a thorough and scientific investigation of the causes and results of war." Hence this volume "**Epidemics Resulting from Wars**" has been produced and very ably edited by Professor Harald Westergaard. It contains most valuable and interesting statistics of the epidemics which have ravished both armies and civil populations from the Thirty Years War to the Siege of Port Arthur in 1904. Dr. Prinzing gives the name of war pestilences "only to those infectious diseases which in the course of centuries have usually followed at the heels of belligerent armies, such as typhus fever, bubonic plague, cholera, typhoid fever, dysentery and small-pox." Scurvy, he says, may also be included in the category of epidemics. Very great difficulties present themselves in war times to efforts calculated to prevent the outbreak of infectious disease. "It will facilitate matters greatly," says Dr. Prinzing, "if in future campaigns the Red Cross devotes its attention not only to the care of the wounded, but also, on a larger scale than it has heretofore, to the prevention of the outbreak and dissemination of war pestilences." Apart from the mortality among troops caused by infectious diseases, Dr. Prinzing calls attention "to the danger to which the civil inhabitants of a country are exposed, when soldiers return home after the termination of a campaign in an infected region." But the enormous advance in the knowledge of sanitation and hygiene will doubtless have done much to arrest the spread of epidemics during this greatest of all wars; for up to the present the only serious epidemic which has been reported is typhus fever in Serbia. When the medical history of this war has been written it will be most interesting to compare the statistics of deaths from infectious diseases with those of this book.

Agriculture After the War, by A. D. Hall, F.R.S. (John Murray). Mr. Hall's admirable little volume "**Agriculture After the War**" is written to emphasise a truth which has been brought home to us during the present war, "that in the interests of the nation as a whole it is necessary to grow at home a larger proportion of the food we consume." Mr. Hall points out "that the land of the British Isles is capable of much greater production than is at present obtained," and he is insistent that more land should be put under the plough. For, he says, "land under arable cultivation produces nearly three times as much food as when under grass, and employs ten times as many men." He outlines five methods for obtaining a more intensive cultivation of the soil and providing employment upon the land. Mr. Hall fully appreciates the difficulties which beset the land-owner and farmer and make him shy of breaking up his pasture. "The commercial success," he says, "of any scheme for the extension of the arable area must

ultimately depend upon the prices that rule for agricultural produce . . . if the State decides that such an increase is necessary in the interests of the national security, it may be driven to adopt some system of bounties or protective duties in order to keep the returns of the farmer up to such a level as will allow of agricultural development." Mr. Hall has written an interesting chapter on the reclamation of land ; and has given many valuable tables of statistics.

Political and Literary Essays, by Lord Cromer. Third Series. (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.) Lord Cromer's third volume of Political and Literary Essays is composed of thirty-four reviews, which have all appeared before in various magazines, but the opportunity of re-reading them in book form is immensely welcome. Two of them are on literary subjects—the "War Poems of Lord Curzon," who, says Lord Cromer, "in the domain of literature displays a courage equal to that which full many a time he has shown in the field of politics and administration"; and "A life of Shakespeare," by Sir Sidney Lee. Lord Cromer considers that "perhaps the most interesting portion of Sir Sidney Lee's work is that in which he deals with the sonnets." In his essay on W. R. Thayer's book, Lord Cromer points out how clearly John Hay saw through the German intrigues in America ; "I would rather," he said, "I think, be the dupe of China than the chum of the Kaiser." The essays on "South America," "The Chinese Revolution," and "Japan" are of great interest ; as is also an appreciation of Delane of *The Times*, whose history, says Lord Cromer, "may in some respects be described as the history of backstairs politics." The other essays are political, and most of them deal with subjects relating to the great war. Lord Cromer discusses the diplomacy of the war, and the part played in it by various countries. He insists that the teaching of such writers as Treitschke and Nietzsche have greatly contributed to the downfall of German morals ; "one of the reasons why we are now at war," he says, "is to prevent the philosophy of Nietzsche from becoming one of the main principles which will serve to guide the future course of progress and civilisation."

Essays and Literary Studies, by Stephen Leacock (John Lane). In this delightful little volume of nine essays Mr. Leacock is at his best. Three of the essays, "The Apology of a Professor," "The Lot of the Schoolmaster," and "Literature and Education in America," deal with things academical. Mr. Leacock points out with humorous satire how both history and a mercenary age have abused the honourable title of professor. "It is a notable fact in the past," he says, "that all persons of eminence who might have shed a lustre upon the academic class, are absolved from the title of professor, and the world at large is ignorant that they ever wore it. We never hear of the author of 'The Wealth of Nations' as Professor Smith, nor do we know the poet of 'Evangeline' as Professor Longfellow. The word professor has become a generic term, indicating the assumption of any form of dexterity, from hair-cutting to running the steam shovel in a crematorium." Mr. Leacock tells us that his ideal school should be situated in some beautiful spot in the mountains and fifty miles from a moving picture. As re-

gards literature, Mr. Leacock finds that the contribution by America to the world's greatest literature has been disappointingly small, though he considers that American humour may claim pre-eminence. He devotes a whole essay to O. Henry and his works, which he deplores are not more widely read this side of the water. There is an essay on the Woman Question, and one entitled "Fiction and Reality" which one wishes was longer. The volume concludes with "A Rehabilitation of Charles II." Mr. Leacock gives us a most pleasing picture of the Merrie Monarch, who was always charming in spite of his many failings, and who, Mr. Leacock states, is to be looked upon as the true founder of the present monarchy.

On the Art of Writing. Lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge, 1913-14, by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, King Edward VII. Professor of English Literature (Cambridge: at the University Press). Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's excellent volume consisting of twelve lectures "On the Art of Writing" will be invaluable not only to students of the art, but to all those who are really interested in literature. Sir Arthur insists that the art of writing should be practised with the purpose of making it "appropriate, perspicuous, accurate, and persuasive," and because "the highest form of persuasion," he says, "cannot be achieved without a sense of beauty." He recommends students to practise verse assiduously, and he points out that "when a nation of men starts making literature it invariably starts on the difficult emprise of verse, and goes on to prose as by an afterthought." There are two particularly interesting lectures on the "Capital Difficulty of Verse" and the "Capital Difficulty of Prose"; and the "Interlude: on Jargon" is most instructive; its two main vices, says Sir Arthur, are "that it uses circumlocution rather than short straight speech . . . and that it habitually chooses vague woolly abstract nouns rather than concrete ones." Then he recommends his audience to study next what he considers "stands the first, or almost first, secret of beautiful writing in English, whether in prose or verse; . . . inter-play of vowel-sounds in which no language can match ours." In the lecture "On the Lineage of English Literature," Sir Arthur points out that except linguistically, our living Prose and Poetry have no derivation from Anglo-Saxon Prose or Poetry, but that Chaucer deserves his title of "Father of English Poetry" "because through Dante, through Boccaccio, through the lays and songs of Provence, he explored back to the Mediterranean, and opened for Englishmen a commerce with the true intellectual mart of Europe." Sir Arthur recommends the study of Greek and Latin authors; but were he limited to three texts on which to preach English Literature he would "choose the Bible in our Authorised Version, Shakespeare, and Homer (though it were but a prose translation)."

The Spirit of Man, an Anthology in English and French from the Philosophers and Poets, made by the Poet Laureate in 1915 (Longmans, Green & Co.). This is a wonderful Anthology, and the Poet Laureate has more than succeeded in taking our thoughts from the present gloom and fixing them on things of beauty and gladness. He has chosen and arranged its passages of poetry and prose according to his individual

taste and on unusual lines, and has thus shown us what a great artist in literature most admires. The French selections are of great charm and delicacy, and as Dr. Bridges says himself, "this book gains great beauty from the grace and excellence of the French items." The arrangement by which no author's name appears underneath his selection, but which with the aid of an admirable index it is easily found, should provide, to those who wish it, an exhilarating and delightful exercise in the testing of their literary judgment.

Twilight in Italy, by D. H. Lawrence (Duckworth & Co., Ltd.). This book is a book of travel impressions of scenes and life in Northern Italy. Mr. Lawrence knows Italy, and it is with a loving and sympathetic pen that he speaks of it and its people. The book is written in clear, pure language, and the chapter "Italians in Exile" is remarkable for its insight and knowledge, and for its tenderly drawn studies of the people.

Highways and Byways in Galloway and Carrick, by the Rev. C. H. Dick, with illustrations by Hugh Thomson (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.). This work constitutes an important addition to a series which has become famous. The style in which it is written is that with which all lovers of the country have become familiar in the other volumes of the series. The illustrations by Hugh Thomson scarcely need to be praised. They would give the book a value and importance even if there were no letterpress to accompany them. The written matter by Dr. Dick is well up to the average of the series. The opinion may indeed be held that it ought to have been considerably above the average, for the country dealt with is one of the wildest and most inspiring parts of Scotland, and an interesting book upon it could be written even by a dullard if he had the industry and opportunity to explore it thoroughly. Hitherto the Highlands of Galloway have chiefly been known to the public through the novels of S. R. Crockett, which, however, are soon found to be geographically inaccurate by anyone who is fortunate enough to have a personal knowledge of the country. Dr. Dick is generally accurate. He has exerted much industry in exploring the least-known corners of this fascinating country, dealing with his subject especially from the point of view of history and folk-lore. He has perhaps been too ready to accept uncritically the statements and legends imparted to him by local residents. He reproduces, for instance, as though it were true, the popular local belief that the trout of Loch Enoch have no ventral fins. This circumstance is attributed to the hardness of the granite sand which forms the bed of the Loch. It is supposed that trout lying on the bottom gradually have their fins worn away by rubbing against the sand, and it is even stated that this characteristic has become congenital, and that the young trout are now born without ventral fins. The whole of this story is entirely devoid of foundation. The latter part of it, indeed, constitutes a rank biological heresy; the former part is simply not the case. Dr. Dick affirms that the fish have now become extinct, but he knows that they were present in 1900. It would be interesting if he had furnished some evidence for the remarkable biological statement which he reproduces. Notwithstanding such minor errors as the above, it cannot be doubted that this work will greatly increase the interest of the country to any tourist who

may be induced to visit it. It is to be expected, indeed, that the book in itself is likely to attract tourists to a country which has hitherto been practically free of them. It is scarcely likely, however, that more than a very few will succeed in penetrating into this region which is one of the wildest parts of Scotland; for there are no Inns or Hotels within a radius of fifteen miles or so, from which even the outskirts of the country can be approached.

Writings by L. P. JACKS. Vol. I. *Mad Shepherds*. Vol. II. *From the Human End*. Vol. III. *Philosophers in Trouble* (Williams & Norgate). These three volumes comprise a collection of essays, many of them satirical in character, exemplifying by means of imaginative stories various aspects of human mentality. Vol. I., "*Mad Shepherds*," approaches most nearly to the domain of fiction. It is largely taken up with the thoughts and doings of an interesting shepherd-philosopher, named Snarley Bob; two of the essays being entitled "*Snarleychology*," Theoretical and Practical. The author is remarkably successful in his efforts to portray character. Vol. II., "*From the Human End*," is the most serious of the three volumes. In the opening essay, providing the title to the book, Professor Jacks draws an antithesis between Science and Humanity; associating the former particularly with Government and the latter with Anarchy; and reaching the conclusion that a compromise must be drawn. Here, however, he has perhaps been somewhat hasty in his premises. It is as incorrect to associate Morals and Government with Science as it is to dissociate them from Humanity. It is not true to say that "*To Science Government is an idol, nay, a very god*." No agreement can be reached on such a proposition; but it is certainly true that many scientific investigations seem to militate strongly against excessive government of any kind. Science, properly regarded, is not a handmaid to industry, but a fine art; and to all forms of fine art, as such, Government is odious and morals irrelevant. Another curious article in the same volume is that which expresses the view that peacefulness of mind to the people at large is an accompaniment and consequence of the war. Vol. III., "*Philosophers in Trouble*," is primarily satirical. Proceeding again by the method of story-telling, the author contrives to present acute criticisms of philosophical method. In such an undertaking, Professor Jacks, as editor of the *Hibbert Journal*, has unrivalled qualifications. We find in these three volumes most of the high attributes which we expect to find in a professional philosopher. But we find also a great many that we do not expect: a keen sense of humour, an extensive knowledge of human nature, and a racy and vigorous literary style. The work as a whole furnishes the most admirable entertainment for the leisure hours of cultivated people. Though here and there we may detect important differences of opinion with the author, the work is in a high and admirable tone from whatever point of view it may be regarded; and though light in method, constitutes a real addition to the literature of the year.

Scientific Papers, by Sir George Howard Darwin, K.C.B., F.R.S. Volume V. Supplementary Volume (Cambridge: at the University Press). This volume completes the publication of Sir George Darwin's Scientific

Papers. It is edited by F. J. M. Stratton and J. Jackson, and contains perhaps more of general interest than the preceding volumes. A frontispiece consists of an excellent and typical portrait of Sir George Darwin himself; and a memoir is contributed by his brother, Sir Francis Darwin. A very interesting account of the scientific work of Sir George is contributed by Professor E. W. Brown. The main part of the book is introduced by the Inaugural Lecture delivered by Darwin at Cambridge in 1883 on his election to the Plumian Professorship. In the main he devoted his remarks to the question of mathematical education in general, and to the position of mathematics in Cambridge University. In the course of an argument insisting upon the necessity for tidiness in mathematical work, he threw some interesting sidelights on the methods of distinguished mathematicians. Lord Kelvin "works in a copy-book, which is produced at railway stations, and other conveniently quiet places for studious pursuits. Maxwell worked in part on the backs of envelopes and loose sheets of paper crumpled up in his pocket; Adams' manuscript is as much a model of neatness in mathematical writing as Porson's of Greek writing." The bulk of the work is taken up, however, by Darwin's lectures on Hill's Lunar Theory. The "Introduction to Dynamical Astronomy," the paper "On Librating Planets and on a New Family of Periodic Orbits," and the address to the International Congress of Mathematicians at Cambridge in 1912, make up the remainder of the volume. The editing and general get-up of the work are fully worthy of the great man of science whose publications it enshrines.

Pathological Lying, Accusation, and Swindling: a Study in Forensic Psychology, by William Healy and Mary Tenney Healy (W. Heinemann). This volume is one of a series of Monograph Supplements to the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*; its publication being authorised by the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology. The subject of which it treats is that of Lying, that is totally disproportionate to any rational estimate of the gains to be expected from such a course; in other words, lying for the sake of lying, and consequent upon evil habits derived by heredity or acquired by upbringing. Cases of actual insanity, however, are excluded. After a general introduction to the subject, and a discussion of the work of previous writers, the authors record a long series of actual cases which were brought within their experience. They then set forth the conclusions at which they have arrived. It appears that the mental characteristics of pathological liars are above the average. According to Risch, "their range of ideas is wide. Their range of interests is wider than would be expected from their grade of education. Their perceptions are better than the average. They are nimble witted. Their oral and written style is above normal in fluency. They exhibit faultiness in the development of conceptions and judgments. Their judgment is sharp and clear only as far as their own person does not come into consideration." The authors of the present work find in common with previous writers that "an unusual number of the pathological liar group show great aptitude for language." The work is to be warmly welcomed as being almost the first study of the subject published in the English language. It not only embodies a considerable amount of valuable material, but is characterised by

scientific care in the framing of conclusions. We may regret the necessity by which the cases recorded are of entirely fictitious persons; but that circumstance probably does not seriously detract from the scientific value of the work.

The Individual Delinquent: a Textbook of Diagnosis and Prognosis for all Concerned in Understanding Offenders, by William Healy (W. Heine-mann). This bulky volume deals with the whole problem of crime from a practical point of view. Like the volume reviewed above, a great part of it is devoted to accounts of actual cases; and this we may perhaps regard as the most valuable part of the work. They deal for the most part with youthful recidivists, in the study of whom Dr. Healy considers the *crux* of the problem to consist. The special purpose of the book is to discover suitable methods of dealing with criminals in practice. Yet his conclusions on this subject are scarcely of a very definite character. He does not exclude retribution from among the proper objects of punishment; but insists as a main factor that the same treatment cannot be applied to all. Individuals vary indefinitely; and the treatment accorded to them should be similarly variable. He discards, of course, the old doctrine that crime indicates congenital abnormality; he emphasises the causative importance of alcohol; and he lays down the general principle that the treatment of offenders should be such as to improve, and not to degrade them. He names physical condition as an interesting and important factor in the production of crime; and insists therefore that the bodily state of all offenders should be examined, and that all forms of disease or malformation should as far as possible be removed. More important still he considers the moral atmosphere of the institutions in which delinquents are detained. Such problems are of course among the most difficult that humanity has to solve, being dependent on deep insight and knowledge among those in responsible authority. The book at all events is a very important contribution to the discussion of an all but insoluble problem.

In Far North-East Siberia, by I. W. Shklovsky ("Dioneo"), translated by L. Edwards and Z. Shklovsky (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.). This is one of the best books of travel published in the course of the year. It is noticeable that works of this character were fewer than usual in a normal year, and that less interest appeared to be taken in them by the public. Doubtless the demand for excitement and adventure was adequately met by the newspaper accounts of the various battles of the war. The present book is largely devoted to the peoples dwelling in the region dealt with. The author gives an account of their habits and mode of life, which indeed appear to be on as low a grade as exists on any part of the earth's surface. He begins with an account of the Kolyma district, then describes a Yakutian wedding, goes down the Kolyma and arrives at Nijne Kolymsk. He then visited the Chooktchi, and subsequently devotes a chapter to Yakutsk. A considerable part of the interest of the book lies in the illustrations; among which may be specially singled out the reproductions of drawings made by Chooktchi. The book is well translated; and furnishes a very readable account in popular form of little-known but interesting peoples.

Raymond or Life and Death, by Sir Oliver J. Lodge (Methuen & Co., Ltd.). This book is one of the most surprising instances of spiritual credulity published during the course of the year. The subject of the book is the son of Sir Oliver Lodge, who was killed in the war; and with whom Sir Oliver believes he has had subsequent communication through the agency of mediums. A large part of the book is taken up with records of the various sittings at which communications were supposed to be held with Raymond in the other world. Although the information retailed by the various mediums seems not infrequently to have been erroneous, there are instances in which its accuracy is difficult to account for, except on one or other of various hypotheses, such as unusual coincidence, fraud, happy guesswork, etc. When all these possibilities have been ruled out, then the incidents in question might perhaps rank as some sort of evidence in favour of the reality of communications between living and dead. But Sir Oliver makes no attempt to rule out these other hypotheses, any one of which is far more probable than the conclusion which he prefers to draw himself. In addition to the reports of *séances*, Sir Oliver attacks the modern theories of scientific materialism; and exhibits his well-known bias towards a spiritualistic system of philosophy. The book apparently has already had a wide influence among persons who are ignorant of the methods of science and the rules of evidence. The main cause for this is that the great majority of men desire to believe doctrines such as those upheld by Sir Oliver. They are restrained only by the knowledge that science will not permit of such belief. When therefore a man of science comes forward and himself advocates the belief, men no longer feel that the barrier of scientific authority is against them; they become free once more to believe whatever gratifies their inborn sentiments. Hence arises the popularity of works such as the present; hence also arises the unpopularity of nearly every philosophic step forward taken by science. It is fortunate for Sir Oliver's fame that his doctrines are those most harmonious to the primitive human emotions; for were he to present doctrines unpleasant to humanity on evidence so frail as this, we fear that his writings would be condemned to a permanent obscurity.

More Minor Horrors, by A. E. Shipley, F.R.S. (Smith, Elder & Co.). This work is a sequel to "The Minor Horrors of War" published by Dr. Shipley the preceding year [*v. ANNUAL REGISTER*, 1915]. It deals with a few of the minor pests of the battleships and trenches, not mentioned in the earlier volume. Among these is the cockroach, better known in the Navy than the Army. The first well-known cockroach to arrive in England was the common one, *Periplaneta orientalis*, which is first mentioned in the seventeenth century as living in England; but two other species have now become established: *Periplaneta americana*, and *Periplaneta germanica*. Nevertheless the earlier arrival remains predominant. In all, ten species of *Blattodea* are said to be resident in Britain. Dr. Shipley describes the anatomy and natural history of these insects, in the manner adopted in his former volume. The longest account of any one animal, however, is that of the mosquito, and its instrumentality in producing malaria and yellow-fever. The Bot-fly, the Biscuit-weevil, the Fig-moth, and the Stable-fly, are also described.

Dr. Shipley finally devotes two useful chapters to rats and the field-mouse. The overwhelming majority of rats fall under the two species *Mus rattus*, the black rat, and *Mus decumanus*, the brown rat. The original home of both is said to be Mongolia; the black rat was the earliest to arrive in England, though it does not appear to be referred to in literature before the sixteenth century. The brown rat is supposed to have arrived about 1730, and now tends to drive out its predecessor. The main importance of rats, from the human point of view, is of course their instrumentality in the spread of bubonic plague. As before Dr. Shipley has written an interesting and informing volume, relieved by frequent humour and a good style.

II. FICTION.

Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion, by Bernard Shaw (Constable & Co., Ltd.). The bulk of this volume is taken up, not by the plays whose names it bears, but by the Prefaces to them, which are now published for the first time. By far the longest of these is the Preface to "Androcles and the Lion," occupying 108 pages. In the course of this brilliant piece of writing, Mr. Shaw runs over the main incidents of the four Gospels, looking at them and at the life of Christ from a wholly secular point of view. He endeavours to show firstly that the actual conduct of mankind is totally incompatible with the teaching of Christ, and with the religion which they profess. He then represents his own socialistic views as being mainly in harmony with that teaching. Mr. Shaw writes with a freedom which might well give offence to many of those whose opinions differ from his own. It is impossible to mistake, however, under the bitter satire in which he clothes his argument, an intense seriousness and conviction which, when backed by great knowledge and great ability, must always command the respect of opponents. Fortunately Mr. Shaw refrains from any reference to the national events of the present time; and it is permissible, while disagreeing with his conclusions, to admire his courage and openness in stating them. The Preface to "Overruled" deals once again with the problem of marriage. We cannot think that Mr. Shaw has succeeded in realising all the difficulties and obstacles in the way of a change in our marriage institutions. Nevertheless his free discussion of the subject may lead to a result scarcely less important than the knowledge of what is truth: namely, the knowledge of what is error.

Pilot and other Stories, by Harry Plunket Greene. Illustrated by H. J. Ford (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.). This is a volume of stories nominally intended for older children, written by Mr. Plunket Greene, whose name is already universally familiar to every one who has the smallest interest in music. Mr. Greene here departs from the sphere in which he has become known to the public, and enters upon a new sphere with a success that is unqualified and remarkable. Although intended for boys, the book is at least equally suitable and equally charming to the adult mind. There runs through it a strong vein of British health and vigour, which is bound to appeal to every one who has succeeded in retaining in an artificial age the virtues of natural simplicity and whole-

someness. The first story is that of a dog named Pilot, and of his various exploits in poaching and other offences which on many occasions nearly cost him his life. The second story entitled "Bluebells" relates the dreams of a little girl who is stranded in Kew Gardens for a night. This very charming story is perhaps from the literary point of view the most meritorious of the collection. It belongs to the class of writing that can be produced only by a genuine artist. The next story named "The Pariah" records the mischievous doings and propensities of a little boy, his various conflicts with the servants, keepers, and other members of the household, and the ruses which he adopted to get the upper hand of all those whom he amiably regarded as his natural enemies. Notwithstanding the tricks which he played upon them, we can well understand that when he was sent to school some of his victims "cried all day long," while others "were so cross that nobody could speak to them for weeks." The other stories in the book are of the same nature. Mr. Plunket Greene has succeeded with this work in establishing for himself a literary reputation which many professional literary people may envy. He proves incidentally the truth of the saying that there is but one form of art, and that any born artist cannot produce inferior work even when he travels into a new sphere. The charm of the book is substantially enhanced by the fine illustrations of Mr. Henry Ford. They are indeed of somewhat different character from those by which he is chiefly known in the Fairy books of Andrew Lang; for Mr. Ford has entered into the spirit of Mr. Greene's conceptions in a way that few artists could. The book constitutes one of the most successful publications of the Christmas season, nor could there be any more suitable present, not only for boys and girls but also for grown-up people.

A Great Success, by Mrs. Humphrey Ward (Smith, Elder & Co.). This new novel of Mrs. Humphrey Ward's is a story of the great social success which a literary man of distinction can achieve in a short time when a certain section of the public is interested. Arthur Meadows, a lecturer, has suddenly become famous, and his lectures on eminent men had begun to draw immense crowds. His third lecture had been listened to by Cabinet Ministers and many people of distinction, and applications for the coming lectures were arriving by every post; also invitations to dinner and to week-end parties were becoming numerous. Arthur Meadows and his wife Doris were young married people, who up to this time had lived quietly and happily, if rather frugally in their small house at Kensington. An invitation had just arrived from Lady Dunstable asking them to spend a week-end at Crosby Ledgers, which caused Doris great uneasiness for several reasons. However, they decided to go. Lady Dunstable had a reputation for knowing something about everything, and for cultivating all celebrities: and as Arthur Meadows had attained to that distinction he was welcomed with great effusion. Lord Dunstable was a kindly man who had allowed his wife to absorb him; but he still was the authoritative spirit in his own house. Their only son was an unsatisfactory youth of twenty-two, quite incurably empty and idle, and who was seldom to be seen under his parents' roof. Lady Dunstable was bitterly and sadly disappointed in her

son, but the son confessed that his mother terrified him. The house-party on this occasion consisted mostly of politicians and literary people. Lady Dunstable was the centre of everything; her political knowledge was astonishing; conversation turned on Arthur's lectures and Lady Dunstable attacked him on several points, but he was able to defend himself effectually; he was evidently on his trial, and the great lady was testing him to see if he was "worthy of her inner circle." Arthur was in great spirits and admired Lady Dunstable immensely. Doris was clearly not to be one of the favoured of Lady Dunstable's guests, but Arthur evidently proved himself worthy, and they were invited to spend a few weeks with the Dunstables in Scotland in August. When August arrived Arthur goes alone and Doris stays at home, excusing herself on the plea that her drawing engagements keep her in town. She worked at her uncle's studio in Campden Hill, and whilst there one day a model arrived for her uncle's work. She was a most vulgar and coarse woman, but she was accompanied by a young man whom Doris found out to be young Dunstable. The model boasted that young Dunstable was shortly going to marry her before his parents could know anything about it. At the studio there was also a young girl whose late father, a clergyman, had held a living on Lord Dunstable's estate. She called to see Doris and begged her to tell Dunstable's parents of his dilemma. Doris does not in the least wish to interfere; but a disgraceful incident occurs in the studio which induces her to speak to the young man. Young Dunstable feels it is his duty to keep his promise to the woman, but he said he would separate from her immediately he married. On reaching home Doris makes a discovery which changed her outlook, and she decides to go at once to Scotland to warn Lord and Lady Dunstable of their son's danger. Meanwhile Arthur had begun to tire of his hostess's dictatorial ways and she had begun to be disappointed in him, and so when Doris arrives suddenly at the great house it is with mixed feelings of pleasure and alarm that Arthur welcomes her. Lady Dunstable receives Doris with great coolness, but her attitude soon changes when Doris makes clear to her the necessity of acting at once on her son's behalf. Fortunately the affair is arranged quite satisfactorily for all parties, and when Arthur questions Doris as to her motive for her generous action he is told of her secret and understands at once.

This is the type of story which no one but Mrs. Humphrey Ward could treat with such perfection.

David Blaize, by E. F. Benson (Hodder & Stoughton), is a school story, and the opening chapter finds David Blaize, the hero, a good-looking, cheerful, bright boy, at the Helmsworth Preparatory School, with his pets, the stag-beetles, his games, and "Bags," his faithful friend and admirer. David is at last put into the cricket eleven and at the great event of the year—the match against Eagles School—his father, an Archdeacon, decides to come down to watch the match. Poor David has memories of his father's last visit and is much alarmed. The Archdeacon knows nothing about cricket and cares less, and his remark, "Well hit, David"—"Christian names at Helmsworth were hidden secrets"—was almost disastrous to David's playing, but the faithful "Bags" interferes and the

day ends happily for David. David passes on to the public school at Marchester where his preconceived notions of the correct thing are all dispelled by Hughes. David soon falls into the school routine, and his hero-worship of Maddox, and in turn Jevons' worship of David, with the friendship of "Bags" always at hand, gives a picture of public school life which is almost perfection. David has his love affair too, but it is of short duration and does not hurt very much. At the end, as is inevitable, David performs a heroic act, but happily he pulls through. This is a very fine story; nothing in the life of a schoolboy is omitted. The incident with David and Maddox is delicately handled and plainly told. The atmosphere of both private and public schools is strikingly indicated.

Mrs. Balfame, by Gertrude Atherton (John Murray). Mrs. Atherton's new story is laid in New England at the provincial town of Elsinore, which is within easy reach of New York. When the story opens Mrs. Balfame, the leader of Elsinore Society and President of the Friday Club, has decided that she can no longer live with her unrefined, uncultivated husband, and so has decided to murder him. She would have divorced him but that this would absolutely prevent her from being the leader of puritanical Elsinore Society. Mrs. Balfame resolved to commit the murder by inoculating him with the germs of a deadly disease. Her devoted friend and admirer Dr. Anna Steuer had talked one day to her on the subject, and one evening whilst at tea with Dr. Anna she was able to steal that "vial of furtive poison" from a cupboard in Dr. Anna's room. On her way home from her friend's house she met her husband's lawyer—Dwight Rush—who had long admired her, for she was a very beautiful and fascinating woman, and who said to her on this occasion, "I want you to divorce Dave Balfame and marry me." She was shocked at the suggestion and gave him no encouragement. Some time afterwards when Mrs. Balfame was at a card party at the County Club her husband suddenly appeared and created a disturbance and disgraced himself before all the company. The sympathies of the whole assembly were with Mrs. Balfame, and every one wondered how such a gifted woman could put up with such a brute. This last insult decided her to act at once, and she made all her preparations carefully and waited; just before it was time for her husband to arrive, on looking out of the window she saw a figure moving in her garden; she hastily put on her coat, transferred her pistol from the table drawer to a pocket and arrived in the garden. Suddenly she heard her husband's voice and then she saw the shadow of the unknown person dodge behind a tree. The next thing she heard was a sharp report and then a groan from David Balfame; she did not stop to think, but the next thing she remembered was that she was in the kitchen closing the door behind her. David Balfame had been fatally shot. The whole of Elsinore Society was in a state of intense excitement, and the question of who shot David Balfame had to be answered. Mrs. Balfame was above suspicion and every kind of person was accused before her, but certain events had to be explained which looked black against her, and during her "trial by newspaper" she came out very badly. Dwight Rush helped her bravely, but her cold-blooded nature seemed to quench the love he had felt formerly for

her. The trial progressed slowly with all the usual American legal formalities. Society thought of nothing else, opinions were divided, some saying it was she and some not; the day of the trial came and the verdict was awaited with feverish anxiety by every one, when a most unexpected event happened and a confession from the real murderer was read out in court by Mr. Rush. It was an intensely dramatic moment; and thus was ended abruptly one of the most exciting cases that Elsinore was ever likely to know. The devotion of that one faithful soul altered Mrs. Balfame's outlook on life entirely, and made of her less of a statue and a possessor of a heart. She gave up Rush, and thus Alys Crumley and he, we hope, were able to have their heart's desire. This is a most exciting story, and the incidents of the murder are told with such a clever air of mystery that one is absolutely unable to guess who the real murderer is. No less interesting than the excitement is the state of society which one finds at this provincial town so near New York which Mrs. Atherton has shown with such skill.

The Little Lady of the Big House, by Jack London (Mills & Boon). Dick Forrest owns a vast estate in California, and as he stands for efficiency, every acre of that land produces its utmost. When the story opens Dick is living in the Big House on the estate with his wife Paula, who is the Little Lady. The house and all its arrangements are on a grand scale, with its music rooms and swimming tanks; everything is worked by rule, the house like the estate gives the greatest amount of comfort and pleasure that is possible. Dick's father died when the boy was quite young and left him the possessor of enormous wealth. The boy at once threw off the yoke of his guardians and travelled quite alone, and afterwards arranged his education on original lines. Dick brought Paula home as his wife from his travels, and the two lived together in perfect happiness. There is always plenty of company in the house, young girls and young men with their never-ending fun; and on the estate philosophers live whose discussions on highly philosophic subjects and whose lively wit make pleasant meetings. Paula is very beautiful and gifted, and Dick is always anxious to show off her accomplishments to all his guests. Happy bright young girls are always with them, but Paula outshines them all, and every one is in love with her and Dick is happy in the thought. One day a new visitor arrives, handsome and strong, a friend of Dick's—Evan Graham. Paula is attracted by him as she has never been to anyone else, and a story in which he swam forty-five miles in forty-five hours with a Polynesian Queen whom he afterwards married, moved her romantic spirit enormously. Dick seems to get more and more engrossed with his work, and these two people are thrown together a great deal; the inevitable thing happens, and they are in love with each other. When Dick makes the discovery he is heartbroken, but is resolved to treat the matter philosophically. He questions Paula and then makes her decide between them. She loves them both and it is hard to choose; but she makes her decision in her own original way and the problem is solved. This is a beautiful story set in beautiful and unusual surroundings. The characters are drawn with great insight and power, and Dick Forrest, with his many and robust characteristics, is a most lovable hero.

These Twain, by Arnold Bennett (Methuen & Co., Ltd.), is the third and last of the trilogy of which *Clayhanger* and *Hilda Lessways* are the other two. In this book *Hilda* and *Edwin Clayhanger* are married, and are living at *Bleakridge*, in the house where *Edwin* had lived with his father and his sister *Maggie*. *Hilda's* son *George* is living with them; *Edwin* and *Hilda* have been married a few months and the story opens on the occasion of the first "At Home." The usual relatives are there and most of the old friends, including *Janet Orgreave*. *Tertius Ingpen*, a new friend, arrives, and makes himself agreeable with his music, and the evening ends by *Hilda* deciding to have a musical evening every fortnight. *Hilda* had been a great success as a hostess, and *Edwin* liked himself in his new rôle as host. *Edwin* was very happy this night, and his thoughts of *Hilda* were very sweet; the old *Hilda* with her sternness and anxious air of responsibility seemed to be hidden in the new *Hilda*, so he thought. He went upstairs full of joy and contentment when suddenly a small incident occurred which changed the whole outlook. "Marriage was a startling affair," he thought. "Who could have foretold this finish to the evening? Nothing had occurred . . . nothing . . . and yet everything." It was almost a week before they were at peace, but in reading *Walt Whitman* and listening to the beauties of *Dvorak's* music together they became friends again; they both realised "the wondrous fact that they both took intense pleasure in the same varied forms of beauty." *George*, *Hilda's* son, was growing up, and *Edwin* and he were great friends, and it was decided between them that *George* should become an architect, and in that decision the occasion occurred for *Hilda* to yield to *Edwin's* great scheme for building new printing works. *Edwin* had been conscious for about twelve months that *Hilda* had been intermittently carrying on correspondence as to which she had said nothing to him; and suddenly *Hilda* arranges to take *Janet Orgreave* to his sister who lives at *Dartmoor*, and before she went she took the mysterious letters with her. They were from the real *Mrs. Cannon* telling her that *George Cannon* had been removed to *Dartmoor*, and that she was working hard to secure his release. *Hilda* had no other reason for hiding these letters from her husband than that she had deep compassion for the old lady and did not want her secrets known to anyone. *Janet* and *Hilda* arrive at *Tavy Mansion*, and *Hilda* felt that even to be on the edge of *Dartmoor* was bracing. *Edwin* joins them, and an invitation comes from the Governor of *Dartmoor* prison for a lawn-tennis party, and also to look over the prison. *Edwin* was horrified at the thought of *Hilda* going, but she was determined; she could not resist the desire of seeing this man again. They went to the prison and saw the prisoners, and there in a group *Hilda* recognised *George Cannon*, the bigamist, and father of her boy. He looked so different from the others; it was a painful ordeal, but *Hilda* went through it without revealing herself. A month later *Hilda* had a letter from *Mrs. Cannon* saying that her husband was at last discharged and was living with her and was being looked after by her. Almost at once *George Cannon* turned up in *Edwin's* office to ask for money to take him to America; the thought of living in his old way was abhorrent to him and he

had to run away. Edwin helped him as he saw the man was genuine, and he was most anxious that George Cannon should never hear that he had had a son. George Cannon behaved well and returned the money which Edwin had lent. Later Hilda became ambitious and wanted to leave the old house and take one in the country. She had difficulty in getting her way but she always managed it at last. "It is marvellous," she said, "I can do what I like with him;" and so it was, and she got her house in the country and there we leave them. Edwin had many surprises and shocks in his married life, but in a "magic vision saw that success in marriage was an affair of good-will and the right tone." This is not the greatest of the three books; but it is a very powerful story. The minor characters—Auntie Hamps, Tertius Ingpen, and Albert Benbow, each in his individual way—help to make the story alive and real.

The Lion's Share, by Arnold Bennett (Cassell & Co., Ltd.), is the story of how a young girl of adventurous spirit suddenly finds herself her own mistress and the possessor of a large fortune. She decides to travel, and the scenes alternate between her home in Essex, London, and Paris. She has many exciting adventures, and the problem of woman's suffrage occupies part of her thoughts and time. Audrey Moze had certainly an "appetite for life," and she saw to it that she got the lion's share. This is a bright, gay, clever story told in Mr. Bennett's lighter vein.

Tales of Wonder, by Lord Dunsany (Elkin Matthews). This is a series of short tales told in Lord Dunsany's inimitable manner; some in the form of fables and some of cities where all is brightness, happiness, and laughter. "The Bird of the Difficult Eye," with its mixture of fable and reality, is particularly fascinating, and so too is the elusive "Why the Milkman Shudders when he Perceives the Dawn." The City on Mallington Moor is a description of one of the cities of beauty and song. The illustrations by S. H. Sime are extremely fine and in keeping with the spirit of the book.

Far-Away Stories, by William J. Locke (John Lane). This is a collection of short stories which the author tells us were written "in calm days far away from the present convulsion of the world," and so he has given them this title. The stories treat of all kinds of subjects, but "An Old-World Episode"—one of the stories under the heading of "Studies in Blindness"—and "Ladies in Lavender" must be singled out for their singular delicacy and charm. "The Scourge" is in another vein; it is a tale of how an arrogant, uncharitable man reforms himself, and in the process many touching details are recounted. For its pathos and greatness of heart "The Song of Life" is a perfect story. Mr. Locke has done well in refusing to allow these beautiful tales "to remain buried in dead magazine numbers."

Held to Answer, by Peter Clark Macfarlane (Eveleigh Nash). This is a story of how a huge, awkward, ungainly youth, with no self-confidence, a typist in a Californian Railway Agent's Office, became by perseverance and force of will one of the greatest powers for good in the small town of Encina. John Hampstead started his career with this motto, "Eternal Hammering is the Price of Success," and he did not lose sight of it during his career. Through hard work at his office he

nearly lost his sight, and he then resolved to give up office-work. He then went as an actor, suffered many privations, humiliations, and hardships; but finally, through an unlooked-for incident, he is chosen unanimously Minister of All People's Church at Encina. It was whilst he was Minister that he is accused of stealing a diamond necklet. The man's noble character is put violently to the test; but in the end through much tribulation, he proves worthy of the trust that most of his people reposed in him. This is a novel in the dramatic style and is worked up to a most telling climax.

The Triumph of Time, by H. A. Vachell (Smith, Elder & Co.). In the opening of the story Tim the boy is in trouble again and is being censured in the vicar's study. Tim lives in Little Pennington—a model village—with the vicar; his mother died shortly after Tim was born. The vicar had made a romantic marriage, running away with the only daughter of an Irish peer. Tim went to the village school because Sir Gilbert Pennington, the Squire, had chosen the schoolmaster. Daffy Carmichael lived at Little Pennington too, and one day Tim kissed Daffy and so because of this event they agreed to marry one day. Tim went to Eton as a Tug; and he unbosoms his thoughts to Daffy of his absolute dislike of everything at Eton: but to the vicar and Sir Gilbert he says nothing. Tim is expelled from Eton on account of an escapade in which “he escaped from the college at night and was caught slightly intoxicated in a not too reputable tavern.” The truth of this story he tells to Daffy in a letter which she never gets. He returned to Little Pennington and it was agreed that he should read for the Indian Civil Service. Again he gets into difficulties and this time it is very serious; it is with Ivy Jellicoe, a girl in the vicar's service, whom he has got into trouble. The vicar is almost heartbroken, and then tells him about the facts of his marriage with Tim's mother, and for the first time Tim hears that the vicar is not his father. He leaves the house and works his way on a boat to San Francisco. He has many adventures and extraordinary escapes from death. The years pass on and the vicar writes to him regularly. Tim marries the pretty daughter of a Spaniard for whom he worked, but he does not tell the vicar. One day Daffy turns up in California; she is married too, and gives him news of all his old friends. Tim's wife dies, and then after more adventures he resolves to return to England. He arrived in England but at once went over to France where he worked at painting and writing. He was successful in both, had a picture hung in the Salon and a book published. Daffy again met him in France, and she at last persuaded him to return to Little Pennington. The vicar was overjoyed at seeing his “son” after sixteen years. There was a boy in the house to whom Tim at once took a liking, and it was not long before he knew why it was that Daffy was so anxious for him to return home. He sought out Ivy Jellicoe and made her happy, and then returned to make his home again in Little Pennington. The vicar was satisfied, and so Tim had triumphed. This is a cleverly told tale and the description of life on the sea and in California are very vivid and striking.

The Winged Victory, by Sarah Grand (W. Heinemann), is the story of the efforts which a young and beautiful girl—the Winged Victory—makes

to improve the condition of the lace-makers ; of the difficulties and surprises which she encounters, and how by inherent greatness of character and heart she is able to overcome them. A great tragedy occurs in her life, but we leave her here making a brave fight. The book is packed full of incident, and there are many admirable characters in it. The old Duke is very lovable, and one feels sorry for his misfortunes. The good and bad sides of society are represented, and the men and women in it are portrayed with extraordinary skill and frankness.

Fondie, by Edward C. Booth (Duckworth & Co., Ltd.), is the story of Fondie Bassiemoor and the inhabitants of the small Yorkshire village of Whivvle. Fondie's real name was Enos, but Whivvle called him "Fondie," which means "Foolish One"; and he accepted the name with unquestioning humility. But he was by no means foolish, there were great creative powers within him, and when the occasion occurred he showed that lurking under that passive exterior were great depths of passion. Blanche was the vicar's daughter and Fondie's heroine; he loved her with deep and undying devotion, and perhaps if Fondie had taken that one kiss which he always longed for, but never had the courage to take, poor Blanche's destiny would have been different. The fine-limbed, free-swinging Blanche "didn't care"; she didn't care for anything as long as she could deck herself in cheap jewellery, read trashy books, wear open-worked stockings, and find new beaux whenever she wanted them. The poor vicar was distraught with her behaviour, but he was helpless and made no impression on his motherless and wayward daughter. At times Whivvle and its inhabitants were "sickening" to Blanche, and then she would go off on the bicycle which Fondie had given her and find attractions elsewhere. Blanche was pretty, perverse, and enormously attractive, and in her narrow surroundings her lively spirits could find no outlet. It was a great day for her when at the garden-party at Mersham the young Squire noticed her; and afterwards his "equestrian figure" was often to be seen at Whivvle; but after a few weeks he had to return to his studies at Oxford, and again Blanche found life in Whivvle "sickening." A month or two after the garden-party the Blanche of old suddenly changed, the Blanche of "Don't cares" and "Aren't frightened" had disappeared, and then the village heard why, and they "hammered her name and character" from morning to night. To poor Blanche all the world had changed since this great discovery of hers, and her only part in it now was to suffer and submit. Fondie "with his heart on fire and his soul suffering" kept silent, until suddenly "Silence could not keep silence longer," and his one act of violence was then recorded. "Let them say but another word against her . . ." and the other word was said and Fondie acted. Blanche is never seen in the village again, and Fondie is the only person whom she cares to talk to. She is sad and lonely, the old Blanche had never been able to think and the new Blanche's thoughts were all of the dread she felt of meeting her fellow-creatures "whose sins taught them no charity"; but at last Destiny takes her by the hand and shows her a way out. It is then that Fondie Bassiemoor came to himself and took upon himself the things that necessity, no less than love, demanded, and

in a chapter of intense beauty and pathos one finds in the wheelwright's son a character than which none finer is to be found in fiction. This is a moving story, exquisitely told, worthy to rank with George Eliot's best. The note of comedy, too, running through the book is of the highest kind. The Yorkshire dialect is reproduced, but it is rendered so naturally that no difficulty is found in reading it.

A Raw Youth, by Fyodor Dostoevsky: from the Russian, by Constance Garnett (William Heinemann). "A Raw Youth" is the autobiography of a very highly-strung Russian youth, who is the illegitimate son of a gentleman named Versilov, by the wife of one of his serfs. His mother, when very young, was married to an old man of her own class named Dolgoruky, who was also a serf of Versilov's, and who is devoted to him in spite of the wrong he has done him. The old man spends the rest of his life as a kind of hermit, going on long pilgrimages, but always returning twice a year to visit his wife, who, with her family, not excluding Versilov, receives him with the warmest welcome. The account of young Dolgoruky's school and student days is very graphically told; he was a man obsessed by an "idea," that of acquiring the riches of a Rothschild; and the way he set about attaining this end is very remarkable. In the course of his career he makes various and strange acquaintances, and gets involved in many intrigues of a doubtful nature, often through no fault of his own. He falls in love with a widow, a good deal older than himself, who encourages him for a time in order to make use of him. He is strongly attracted to his father Versilov, of whom at first he knows little, and later fiercely hates and loves by turns. The character of this strange man who fascinates all who come into the sphere of his influence, forms the chief interest of the book, which Fyodor Dostoevsky has written in three parts, and which in spite of a certain grossness of style, is exceedingly exciting and interesting to the end.

The Brook Kerith, by George Moore (T. Werner Laurie, Ltd.). The book opens with the childhood of Joseph of Arimathea in his father's house in the village of Magdala. Joseph had a good education, and his knowledge of Hebrew and Greek admitted him into the confidence of Jews and Gentiles alike. He went to Jerusalem to attend the Feast of the Passover in his father's place, and whilst there he heard of the "Essenes," a third sect of the Jews, but not viewed in high favour in Jerusalem. He had been much troubled with the many religious doctrines which surrounded him, and he resolved to go to the Censby on the eastern bank of the Jordan to see the brethren himself. He found them and puts his difficulties to the president, whose words, "it matters not how we worship, if our worship comes from the heart," gave Joseph great comfort. He stayed with the Essene brotherhood a short time, but on hearing that John the Baptist was preaching, "He whom the world is waiting for has come," he hastened to the Jordan only to hear that John had just left with Jesus the Essene. Joseph then went in quest of Jesus in Egypt, in the hills of Judea, and at last found Him at Capernaum where He lodged in the house of Simon Peter. Joseph followed Jesus whilst He taught, and was wholly absorbed in his love of Jesus, and felt that at last the promised Messiah was amongst them. Jesus with His disciples

Peter, James, and John went about preaching and working miracles which were received with delight; but the priests stirred up the people against Jesus, giving it forth against Him that He had come to Jerusalem to burn down the Temple and would set up another built without the help of hands. Joseph next heard that the people had crucified Jesus and he went to Pilate to ask for the body to bury in his sepulchre. Pilate heard that Jesus was put on the cross at noon and was dead before the ninth hour and so granted Joseph's request. Jesus was laid in Joseph's tomb. Joseph went into the tomb for one last look at Him, but found the sheet which Martha and Mary placed over the face had fallen away. "He is not dead, He is not dead, he cried," and then hope came to Joseph, and he took Jesus to his house secretly where he nursed Him back to health. And then there were stories of a great miracle. Martha and Mary had been to the tomb and found the stone rolled away, and there they found a young man in white raiment seated where Jesus was overnight, and from him they learnt "that He whom they sought was risen from the dead." When Jesus was better, He one day said to Joseph, "I was carried here by an angel, for I felt the feathers off his wings brush across My face"; but Joseph answered, "No, Jesus, it was I that carried Thee out of the sepulchre," and when he had contradicted Jesus he was sorry, for he saw that Jesus looked pained and so ill that He was about to swoon again. Jesus never spoke about the angels again. Soon after this Jesus suddenly resolved to return to the Essenes, and He joined those brethren who had gone to the Brook Kerith and had taken possession of a cave in the rocks above it. Jesus was welcomed by the president Hazael and the brethren, and He agreed to take charge again of their flocks. Joseph had accompanied Him to the Brook Kerith, and on his journey back they heard that he had been killed in the streets of Jerusalem by order of the Zealots. Jesus' grief was unbounded. He went back to His sheep, and He felt great joy to be able again to return to thought whilst wandering over the hills, "and He had learnt to prize the earth and live content among His sheep." After twenty years Jesus returned to the Censby and gave up His charge of the sheep. On that night Paul arrived at the Brook Kerith to escape the assaults of the Jews. He spoke to the brethren of the Lord Jesus Christ whom God had chosen to redeem men by His death and resurrection from the dead. Paul told of his conversion, his visions, and of his subsequent journeys and teaching and of his sufferings. Jesus was not present during Paul's narrative, but when He heard of it from the brethren He was overcome with a great pity for Paul, and resolved to tell the story of the two years of His life of which nothing was known to the brethren. After it was told He bid farewell to the brethren; for the rule of the order, He said, "forbids Me to stay," "those who commit crimes like mine are cast out and left to starve in the desert." "I will go to Jerusalem, Jesus said, and "tell the people that I was not raised from the dead by God." On His way He came upon Paul "who was lying in a swoon with foam on his lips," and after Jesus had helped him they journeyed along together. Jesus asked Paul, "What value would thy teaching be if Jesus did not die on the Cross," and Paul answered, "My teachings would be as naught if our Lord Jesus had not died," and Jesus felt a great pity for Paul and

decided that if he was persuaded there was no miracle "his mind would snap." He talked further with Paul and told him of the thoughts and beliefs which had come to Him whilst wandering over the hills. "God did not design us to know Him but through our consciousness of good and evil, only thus far may we know Him." Paul did not understand, but when Jesus left him He felt he would not go to Jerusalem to provoke the Jews against Him. And Paul went on his journey and arrived at Rome where he continued to teach his doctrine. This is a unique story, marvellously conceived, and written in the purest English.

SCIENCE OF THE YEAR.

As regards pure science the year was singularly unproductive of any discoveries of importance. The factors referred to in the ANNUAL REGISTER for 1915, which led to a temporary cessation of scientific progress, remained in operation throughout 1916. First among these factors was the cessation of co-operation between men of science of different countries. It is true that throughout 1915 and the earlier months of 1916, German scientific periodicals found their way in diminishing numbers to this country, but towards the end of 1916 the restrictions even upon this minor source of interchange of ideas became almost prohibitive, and English men of science were able to obtain little information as to the doings of their confrères in Germany.

The second factor which was named in the ANNUAL REGISTER for 1915 as tending to an arrest of scientific progress, namely, the decline of interest in science and the diversion of that interest into more material channels, also held good for 1916, although in a somewhat qualified manner. It cannot be said indeed that there was any revival of interest in pure science for its own sake. Such an event was rendered increasingly impossible by the demands of the State upon the time and energy of individuals. An age of turmoil and disorder in which political history is being made is unsuitable for the development of the refined discrimination and concentrated interest required for the progress of science and the other fine arts. For these the most favourable atmosphere is one of social calm in which politics and history make small demands upon the thought and attention of the people.

Nevertheless, there has to be recorded a gradual rise of interest in science at large, mainly due to the propaganda of various bodies which had been formed for the promotion of this end. These bodies did not as a rule advocate science in the pure spirit of the philosopher; they advocated it almost entirely on utilitarian grounds; and the arguments which they used, it must be admitted with great effect, were directed to show the dangers to the State which followed upon scientific ignorance in time of war, the advantages which Germany had derived from her more intense and methodical applications of scientific knowledge, and finally the imperative necessity for a greater attention to science in the re-organisation of industry after the war, in view of national industrial competition with Germany and other nations. Accordingly the efforts of many men of science were turned during 1916 largely to what may be called the politics of science rather than to the making of new knowledge, which constitutes science proper. They set before themselves the task of

remedying the popular apathy towards science which was alluded to in the ANNUAL REGISTER for 1915.

The first and most important body organised for the purpose of promoting public interest in science and of elevating its status was a body which called itself at first the Science Reorganisation Committee and subsequently the Committee on the Neglect of Science. This body issued to *The Times* and other newspapers, on February 2, a memorandum signed by a large number of distinguished men of science, urging the national necessity for a far larger inclusion of science in public education. The memorandum pointed out that not only were our highest Ministers of State ignorant of science, but that the same defect ran through almost all the public departments and the Civil Service. Such ignorance was nearly universal in the House of Commons and was shared by the general public, an important exception which was named being furnished by the Navy and by the Medical service of the Army. The definite suggestions of the Committee were that a Bill should be passed directing the Civil Service Commissioners and Army Examination Board to give a preponderating or at least an equal share of marks in their competitive examinations to natural science subjects; and the ultimate replacement of the Board of Trade by a Ministry of Science, Commerce, and Industry. If such a course were pursued, it was hoped that a popular appreciation and understanding of science would begin to develop and that our officials of all kinds, no less than Members of Parliament, would come to be as much ashamed of ignorance of the commonplaces of science as they would now be if found guilty of bad spelling and arithmetic.

The issue of this memorandum was followed by a conference in the rooms of the Linnean Society on May 3, which was attended by a far greater number of people than accommodation could be found for. Lord Rayleigh was in the chair, although it was well known that the moving spirit in the organisation of the proceedings was Sir Ray Lankester. Resolutions were passed demanding that for the promotion of national efficiency natural science should be made an integral part of the educational course in all the great schools of this country and should form part of the entrance examinations of the Universities of the country; that the Government should assign capital importance to natural science in the competitive examinations for the Home and Indian Civil Services; that some knowledge of natural science should be required from all candidates for admission to Sandhurst; that only by these steps could be attained the desired alteration in the attitude of schools and colleges throughout the country towards natural science; and finally, that it was a matter of urgency that steps should at once be taken by H.M. Government in the direction indicated.

For a time it seemed as though these propaganda had fallen upon barren ground. The intention of the Government was announced shortly afterwards of closing the public museums during the period of the war, and a deputation to the Prime Minister succeeded in obtaining scarcely any modification of this order. Nevertheless, as time went on and the national necessities became constantly more urgent, it was apparent that the movement had obtained more influence than had at first

appeared to be the case. Towards the end of the year it was announced that in future some knowledge of science would be necessary for the B.A. degree at Oxford; Latin also was struck out from among the compulsory subjects of the Preliminary Medical Examination for medical students; and on December 1, Lord Crewe, Chairman of the Committee of the Privy Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, received a deputation from the Board of Scientific Societies, introduced by Sir J. J. Thomson, President of the Royal Society. It was then announced that the Government had decided to establish a separate department of Scientific and Industrial Research for Great Britain and Ireland under the Lord President of the Council, with the President of the Board of Education as Vice-President. They had also decided, subject to the consent of Parliament, to place a large sum of money at the disposal of the new department, to be used as a fund for the conduct of Research for the benefit of the national industries on a co-operative basis. The Board of Inland Revenue had decided, moreover, with the approval of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to offer no objection to the allowance as a working expense for income tax purposes of contributions by traders to Industrial Associations, which might be formed for the sole purpose of Scientific Research for the benefit of various trades. A Royal Charter had been granted to the official Members of the Committee of the Privy Council for Scientific and Industrial Research under the title of "Imperial Trust for the Encouragement of Scientific and Industrial Research." The permanent Secretary of the new department was to be Mr. H. Frank Heath, C.B., and from the end of the year the department was to be housed in Great George Street, Westminster.

The propaganda for the promotion of scientific knowledge were met by counter-propaganda, although of a less vigorous character, in favour of the retention of Latin and Greek in the Universities. Emphasis was laid upon the admirable qualities which the war had shown to be possessed by the young men of the country who had been brought up on an education which was largely of Latin and Greek. Moreover, even among men of science themselves, some resentment was occasionally expressed at the commercialisation of science and the advocacy of it from the special point of view of subservience to industrial progress. These men of science held the view that science should be pursued primarily for its own sake and not with any utilitarian object. They objected to its being based upon an attitude of ethical materialism, and they believed that all the idealistic qualities and training of character alleged to flow from an education in the humanities would flow with an even greater force from an education in pure science alone, divorced from any association with purposes of immediate material welfare. To these arguments it was replied that the public interest in science at the present time was of so low an order that such a reform as was needed would be impracticable unless emphasis were laid on the material prosperity which was likely to result from a wider general knowledge of science. However this might be, it is certain that the status of science rose somewhat in the course of the year. It remained, of course, greatly inferior to the status of industry and still more of

politics and Government. But some start was made in the initiation of a movement which it was hoped might lead in the future to a higher and more idealistic state of public opinion.

The Royal Society held its Annual Meeting on November 30 when Sir J. J. Thomson was re-elected President, Sir A. B. Kempe, Treasurer, Professors A. Schuster and W. B. Hardy, Secretaries, and Professor W. A. Herdman, Foreign Secretary. The awards of medals by the President and Council for the year were as follows: A Royal Medal to Dr. J. S. Haldane, F.R.S., for his services to chemical physiology, more especially in reference to the chemical changes of respiration; a Royal Medal to Professor H. M. Macdonald, F.R.S., for his contributions to mathematical physics; the Copley Medal to Sir James Dewar, F.R.S., for his investigations in physical chemistry, more especially his researches on the liquefaction of gases; the Rumford Medal to Professor W. H. Bragg, F.R.S., for his researches in X-Ray radiation; the Davy Medal to Professor Henri Louis le Chatelier for his researches in chemistry; the Darwin Medal to Professor Yves Delage for his researches in zoology and botany; the Sylvester Medal to M. Jean Gaston Darboux for his contributions to mathematical science; and the Hughes Medal to Professor Elihu Thomson for his researches in experimental electricity.

The British Association held its eighty-sixth Annual Meeting at Newcastle-on-Tyne. This meeting, which opened on September 5, was, as in the case of the previous year at Manchester, almost exclusively of a business character, and lasted only three days. The Council of the Association elected Sir Charles Parsons to the office of President for the meeting which was to take place at Bournemouth in the following year. For the present year Sir Arthur J. Evans was President, and devoted his address to the subject of "New Archeological Light on the Origin of Civilisation in Europe; its Magdalenian Forerunners in the South-West and *Ægean* Cradle." He pointed out that the evolution of human art and appliances in the last quaternary period was on a far higher level than had ever been previously suspected. Evidence had been flowing in of a more or less continuous civilised development which had reached its apogee about the close of the Magdalenian period. It was now clear that our later civilisation stood immediately on a neolithic foundation; and it might be confidently stated that the earliest extraneous sources on which it drew were in the Valley of the Nile on the one side and in that of the Euphrates on the other. The rise of Hellenic civilisation could no longer be regarded as a sudden prodigy but was part of a wider economy, and had been affiliated to the civilisation of pre-historic Crete to which the first quickening impulse came from the Egyptian and not from the Oriental side. Nor could ancient Egypt any longer be regarded as something apart from general human history, and its influences were seen to lie about the very cradle of our own civilisation.

Sir Arthur Evans then went on to consider the culture which had begun to rise in Crete in the fourth Millennium before our era and had flourished for some 2,000 years. He commented on the modernness of much of the life which had been revealed in that ancient period, such, for instance, as in the elaboration of the domestic arrangements and the

staircases storey upon storey. In this civilisation, religion had entered at every turn ; and it was perhaps owing to the religious control of art that no single example of indecency had come to light. In spite of the overthrow which about the twelfth century before our era fell on the old Minoan dominion, much of the old tradition survived to form the basis of the later civilisation of Greece. Thus had the lighted torch been carried on, the first glimmering flame of which had been painfully kindled by the old cave-dwellers in the paleolithic world.

It was typical of the trend of scientific thought during the year that the presidential addresses to the various sections and the discussions which followed them were largely devoted to what we have called the politics of science, rather than to any purely scientific or philosophic questions. As *The Times* put it, most of the papers and discussions were notable for their "practical" character. Special importance was attached to the address of Professor A. W. Kirkaldy to the Economic Science and Statistical Section on the subject of reconstruction after the war. Professor Kirkaldy took the view that although there was nothing tangible to show for the expenditure on the war, the people would emerge from it better disciplined and more capable mentally and physically to cope with new conditions. Passing to a forecast of the industrial future of the country, he prophesied that when the war was over England and Germany would for some time be the only two European nations prepared to take any considerable part in international trade. He insisted on the need for national organisation and a better system of industrial and commercial intelligence. Employers should be organised into national and local associations of one trade, and into national and local federations, while work-people should have unions and federations corresponding to those of the employers. From these two representative bodies there could be elected an Industrial Council as a Court of Appeal enjoying far-reaching powers.

In many of the sections the need for introducing more science into industry was emphasised. Professor G. G. Henderson, in his address to the Chemical Section, referred to the general ignorance and indifference to the methods and results of scientific work which characterised the people of this country. Professor W. S. Boulton, in his address to the Geology Section, also deplored the public indifference to science in general which he said was responsible for our comparative failure to apply effectively the resources of geology to practical affairs. Efforts should be made for the discovery and development of concealed coal-fields, and attention should also be devoted to the origin and occurrence of petroleum.

The Educational Section was under the Presidency of the Rev. W. Temple. He depreciated any exaggerated admiration for the German system of education, pointing out that, although in the organisation of material resources it had brought a well-deserved success, yet in regard to moral conduct and to the art of dealing with other men and other nations, it had led to action which called forth the horror of the civilised world. Dr. Temple considered therefore that with all its faults, English education was a thing generically superior to the German. After insisting upon the need for manual and physical training as the basis of education, he affirmed that the ultimate aim was primarily spiritual

and that there were three primary aims only of the spiritual life, these being goodness, truth, and beauty.

In the Anthropology Section, Professor Keith read a paper of more purely scientific interest. He said that a minute comparison of skulls showed that the English face was becoming narrower and longer owing to the general reduction which was affecting all the parts concerned in the act of chewing. The most definite changes in the modern skull were in the jaws, palate, and teeth; and over 10 per cent. of the population showed a deficiency in these respects which had only become common in quite recent centuries.

In the Geographical Section Colonel Sir Thomas Holdich opened a discussion on political boundaries which excited considerable interest. He took the view that the best way to preserve peace among nations was to part them by as strong and as definite a physical boundary as could be found. The annexation of territory against the will of the people had always been regarded as a political blunder. As a means of ascertaining the will of the people he condemned taking a plébiscite as the surest possible way of starting an armed conflict. In the reorganisation of boundaries which was destined to follow the war, he thought that it would not be difficult to ascertain the wishes of the majority of the people concerned. The best boundaries were mountain ranges, but failing this the ordinary divide between the heads of minor affluents of a river basin were quite a useful alternative. Sir Thomas added that rivers were also important in the fixing of political frontiers, though it depended on conditions of environment whether a river made a good boundary or not. The Western frontiers of Germany were not protected by the Rhine so much as by the Rhineland Fortresses. In the discussion which followed Professor Lyde disputed the conclusions of Sir Thomas Holdich, holding that a river boundary was preferable to a mountain one, and that the best boundary was one which enabled the maximum of peaceful association with a minimum of warlike association. Sir Arthur Evans subsequently expressed his view that Italy in securing herself on the Adriatic must do so by wise means. While we had sympathised with Italy in freeing Venice and Lombardy, we could also sympathise now with Serbia in seeking development.

A discussion took place also in the Economic Section on the outlets for labour after the war. The basis for this discussion was the report of a Committee formed to investigate the replacement of male by female labour in consequence of the war. The Committee said that up to two months previously, over half a million women had replaced men who had left their occupations for more urgent national service. They were chiefly women who had had no previous industrial experience, and the replacement had taken place throughout the whole of industry except where the work was highly skilled. Even in these cases, new machinery of a more automatic kind had sometimes been introduced even to such an extent as almost to transform an industry. The report stated that the success of women had been marked. They learnt quickly, they were good time-keepers, they stood the strain of long hours extremely well, and possessed great manual dexterity. Their success, however, had been less on work demanding greater judgment and adaptability. It was likely that the problem of a large surplus of women after the war might not be

so serious as had been feared. The married women were for the most part only engaged for the period of the war, and inquiry among women workers generally showed that many of them had no desire to remain in competition with men. Nevertheless, if the subdivision of processes of the highly skilled automatic machinery which had been introduced owing to the war had come to stay, there might be a change in the relative demand for skilled and unskilled labour to the disadvantage of the former.

Mr. Christopher Turnor urged the necessity of setting up Wages Boards for labourers and a complete land settlement scheme for the man who wished to work for himself. Afforestation and the reclamation of waste land must, he said, be undertaken. Sir John Stirling-Maxwell said that during the war we had learned that dependence for timber on foreign countries was a heavy handicap. Every year the demand increased and prices rose, while the quality went down. Although we could not become a self-supporting country, he thought we should aim at making the Empire self-supporting, and then content ourselves in the United Kingdom with providing sufficient wood for a period of five years, in which war or some other crisis might interfere with our imports.

Another important report was published by a Committee which had been appointed for dealing with the subject of fuel economy, the utilisation of coal, and smoke prevention. According to this report the supplies of easily obtainable coal in this country during the past century had given us an advantage over all other countries; but that advantage could not any longer be claimed over our two closest competitors. There could be little doubt that up to the present we had been wasteful and improvident in regard to getting and utilising coal, and the general adoption of more scientific methods was a matter of vital importance. Two outstanding features of the history of the British Coal Trade were the steady increase of the total output of our mines and the phenomenal growth of our export trade which during the last sixty years had increased something like twenty-fold. The Committee had not concluded its work and was reappointed as before under the Chairmanship of Professor W. A. Bone.

Another discussion in which considerable interest was excited was one dealing with the effect of the war on credit currency and finance. Here again a report was presented, prepared by a Conference which had been appointed the previous year, in the course of which it was pointed out that credit had now adapted itself to a state of war. The need for emergency currency had become less and it was now desirable to concentrate the country's stock of gold. There had been no increase in the gold reserve since the previous year while the note issue had been trebled. Great exports had been made, but the British Empire still controlled two-thirds of the world's output of gold, and there was therefore no good reason for any moral or patriotic impediment to the most perfect freedom of gold export. The report further discussed the relative advantages of financing the war by loans and by taxation, and expressed a doubt whether much additional revenue could be obtained from further taxation of commodities. If further revenue was required it must be obtained by a more scientific and equitable income tax under which contributions levied from the working class would be taken by

income tax on wages collected through the employer. In the course of the discussion on this report Mr. A. H. Gibson expressed his opinion that the amount of internal war loans which might be raised under modern banking conditions was almost unlimited; and he could conceive the United Kingdom being able to mortgage prosperity to the extent of at least 10,000,000,000*l.* if necessary. Speaking of our gold reserves, he said that he believed that the amount of gold still hoarded in this country must be from 15,000,000*l.* to 20,000,000*l.*

A large number of scientific discoveries and inventions for warlike purposes were made during the course of the year, but we are prevented for the same reason as in the case of last year from giving any account of their nature. Medicine and surgery continued to make rapid progress in the new sphere which was opened up by the casualties of war. In April a case was presented to the Academy of Science at Paris of a Corporal who had been wounded on September 7, 1914, at the Battle of the Marne and had lived for a year with a bullet in his heart. On September 6, 1915, his heart was opened and the bullet extracted, the patient being out of danger in a fortnight.

In the sphere of medicine further progress was made in the study of gas-gangrene, which was traced to a specific bacterium, and also in the study of shell shock. In the course of the Lettsomian Lectures in the early spring, Dr. F. W. Mott developed the theory that shell shock was due in great part to carbon monoxide poisoning, basing this opinion upon the analogous condition of the brain which showed in each case minute punctate hæmorrhages. Many considerations, however, appeared to militate against this view which found little acceptance as the year went on. A peculiarity of shell shock was found to be that it was almost always confined to unwounded men. There is no doubt that it was a functional nervous complaint in which the hysterical elements preponderated over the neurasthenic. Most of these cases recovered after a sufficient period of rest. No specific treatment appeared to be of much value. Hypnotism was extensively used but no results of importance were attained beyond what might be attributed to suggestion.

The report of the Royal Commission on venereal diseases is published in the section on public documents [*v. p.* 27]. On April 14 Mr. Long, President of the Local Government Board, received a deputation on this subject, in reply to which he announced a scheme for giving effect to the most immediate and practical recommendations contained in the final report of the Royal Commission. That scheme comprised free diagnosis and treatment in general hospitals organised by local authorities and subsidised by the Imperial Exchequer to the extent of 75 per cent. of the cost. This was the only one of the recommendations of the Royal Commission which were adopted in the course of the year, and the only one which could be adopted without legislation. It was, however, regarded as a very important beginning, since the accumulation of large armies in all parts of Europe had already given rise to a marked general increase of venereal disease.

The question of man-power which was so persistently agitated throughout the year, gave special interest to the fluctuations in the birth-rate which occurred as a consequence of war. On April 17 the report of the Registrar-General on births, deaths, and marriages in 1914

was issued as a Blue Book [C.D. 8206]. This report showed that the birth-rate had then reached the lowest point on record. The population of England and Wales at the middle of 1914 was estimated at 36,960,684, made up of 17,877,052 males and 19,083,632 females. The marriage-rate during the year was 15.9 persons married per 1,000 population, or slightly higher than the average of preceding years. The number of persons divorced was very considerably higher, reaching 1,712 against 1,154 in 1913. The birth-rate was 23.8 per 1,000, being 2.1 below the average for the preceding decennium. The total number of births was 879,096, of which 37,329 were illegitimate. By far the lowest birth-rate was found in the South of England and was attributed in this report to a real diminution in fertility. While the birth-rate was lower than in 1913, the death-rate was higher, and the rate of natural increase for 1914 was only .1 above that of 1911, which was the lowest yet recorded. The total number of deaths registered in the year was 516,742, giving a rate of 14.0 per 1,000 population.

The first quarter of 1915 seemed to indicate a continuance of this decline in the birth-rate, for the rate then reached only 22.9 per 1,000. In the fourth quarter of 1915 the rate had fallen still lower, namely, to 19.5 per 1,000 population, and was then 4.6 per 1,000 below the mean birth-rate in the ten preceding fourth quarters and 2.7 per 1,000 below the rate in the corresponding period of 1914. This, in fact, was the lowest birth-rate recorded in any quarter since the establishment of civil registration.

The same process was observed in the sixty-first Annual Report of the Registrar-General for Scotland dealing with the year 1915. The number of births registered in Scotland during that year was 114,181, this being the smallest number in any year since 1869. The birth-rate for 1915 was 23.86 per 1,000, the lowest since the institution of national registration. The number of deaths, on the other hand, exceeded that of any previous year since 1855, with four exceptions only. It was shown that the fall in the birth-rate commenced in May, 1915, that is to say, nine months after the declaration of war, and continued to the end of the year. No corresponding fall was found in the marriage-rate, which indeed in some districts was notably higher.

These figures caused considerable anxiety as to the replenishment of future generations in this country, and various steps were taken to arrest the progress of the decline. Propaganda were carried on by the Red Cross which appeared to be having a favourable effect; for in the third quarter of 1916 the birth-rate showed a slight rise, being in fact 21.7 per 1,000 of the population, as compared with 19.5 in the last quarter of 1915. Male births were in proportion to female births as 1,045 to 1,000, and the natural increase of population in England and Wales during the quarter by excess of births over deaths was 95,836.

Another measure which was taken for promoting the increase of population was one recommended by a body called the National Commission on the Birth Rate, which had appointed itself some years previously and issued a report in June. This Commission reached the conclusion that a practice prevailed to a wide extent among the industrial classes of avoiding parenthood by the illegal induction of abortion. It

was stated that a particular preparation of lead was extensively used for this purpose in the Northern towns. Representations were made on the subject to the Government and obstacles were then placed in the way of the sale of this and other noxious drugs.

Geographical science was advanced in various respects by two exploring expeditions which had been initiated before the beginning of the war. The first of these was that of Sir Aurel Stein who arrived in London in the course of May after a journey through Central Asia which had occupied nearly three years. On June 5 Sir Aurel gave an account of his discoveries to the Royal Geographical Society. One of his most important discoveries was in tracing the ancient route through the Lop Desert and the numerous ruins along that part of it which lay through a dried-up ancient delta. It was by this route that the ancient Chinese conveyed all their silk to Central Asia and the Mediterranean. A series of grave-pits were found near the route which yielded a rich antiquarian haul, mixed up with human bones and fragments of coffins. There were household implements of all sorts, such as decorated brass mirrors, wooden models of arms, Chinese records on paper and wood, and a wonderful variety of fabrics, among them beautifully coloured silks, pieces of rich brocade and embroidery, fragments of fine pile carpets in abundance by the side of coarse fabrics in wool and felts. These relics dated from the second century B.C., and seemed to Sir Aurel to open up a new and fascinating chapter in the history of textile art. Other discoveries included a petrified sea with a shore line under steep cliffs. The ancient track was plainly marked in the salt-encrusted ground. One hundred and fifty miles of the track were traced with accuracy by finds of coins and other small objects accidentally dropped. In one place the direction in which a convoy had moved was clearly marked by thousands of copper coins strewn upon the ground which had probably been dropped from a load during a night march and had remained untouched for at least 1600 years. In Chinese Turkestan there still stood a large ancient orchard showing with much clearness the elaborate arrangement of fruit trees and vines carried over trellis, all dead. This settlement had been abandoned nearly 1700 years ago, and the river which once carried water to it now loses itself in the sand at a very great distance away.

Finally, we have to record the conclusion of the Shackleton Expedition to the South Pole which had set out at the beginning of the war. The *Endurance* left England in August, 1914, for Buenos Aires and was joined by Sir Ernest Shackleton in October of that year. The Expedition then left Buenos Aires for South Georgia in the hope of landing on the Weddell-Sea coast of the Antarctic continent early in December. Sir Ernest's plan was that, while certain scientific members of the staff would carry out research from the Weddell Sea base, he himself, with a party, would push across the route already partly traversed by himself to the ice barrier in Ross Sea, where he was to be met by a party from Australia in the *Aurora*. The *Aurora* left Sydney in December, 1914, to take up her station on Ross Island at the edge of the great ice barrier to await the arrival of the leader of the Expedition and his party. Meanwhile, the *Aurora* party were to carry on scientific work and to lay down a series of depôts across the barrier to the great glacier and for a

considerable distance towards the South Pole for the use of the Trans-continental party on the second half of their journey. This journey was no less than 1700 miles. Sir Ernest Shackleton hoped to start upon it in December, 1914, but in a message sent from South Georgia in January, 1915, he announced that the ice conditions in the Antarctic were too unfavourable to give any hope of a start that season.

The Expedition was dogged by misfortune almost from the start. On March 24 Mr. Jensen, the Minister for the Navy at Melbourne, received a wireless message from the *Aurora* announcing that she had been driven from her moorings at Ross Island and after drifting 500 miles had been released from the ice in a dilapidated condition on March 14, and was returning to New Zealand. Ten men had been left behind on Ross Island when the ship broke from her moorings in May, 1915, but there was reason to believe that their provisions were quite sufficient to last them until relief could be sent.

Meanwhile, similar misfortune had attended Sir Ernest Shackleton and the *Endurance*. The vessel was wrecked, and on April 15 the leader and his companions landed on Elephant Island. Owing to the seriousness of the situation, Sir Ernest with five men set out on April 24 in a small boat for South Georgia, 750 miles away, leaving twenty-two men under the leadership of Mr. Frank Wild on the Island. This perilous journey was safely accomplished, and on reaching South Georgia Sir Ernest made a first attempt at rescue in a whaler. It failed, and he then went to the Falkland Islands whence he again sailed for Elephant Island in a vessel lent by the Uruguayan Government. Thick ice, however, prevented an approach to the Island, and in July a third attempt, equally futile, was made to rescue the men, a 70-ton schooner, called the *Emma*, being employed. This ship was forced back by heavy gales and ice. Block ice was encountered north of the Island which it was found impossible to drive through. The ship was badly knocked about and her engine being injured she had to return under sail to the Falkland Islands. Meanwhile, the British Government had fitted out Scott's old boat, the *Discovery*, to start upon a relief expedition, but before she could be dispatched Sir Ernest Shackleton had started upon his fourth attempt in the *Yelcho*, which left Punta Arenas on August 26. This attempt was at last successful, and Sir Ernest reached the camp of the marooned men on August 30. They had been on Elephant Island for over four months and had made a dwelling of their two boats supported by rocks and set up as far as practicable from the sea. The weather which they had experienced was appalling, the vitality of the party was lowered owing to exposure, and in May they were nearly swept away by heavy seas and by a blizzard which was blowing at seventy miles an hour. Blocks of ice were hurled to within fifteen feet of their dwelling, and severe economy of food had to be practised. Although several members of the party suffered from frost-bite and exposure they all eventually recovered.

On December 22 the *Aurora*, with Sir Ernest Shackleton on board, sailed from Port Chalmers for the relief of the ten men left on Ross Island in May, 1915. No news of this expedition had been received at the end of 1916.

ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC.

I. ART.

THOUGH dwarfed by issues of more national importance, the Fine Art record for the year was remarkable ; chief interest was concentrated on the National Gallery. Sir Charles Holroyd, the Director, after two strenuous terms of office, retired in April. Inadequate tribute may here be paid to the assiduity with which he fulfilled his duties, no less than to the patience and silence with which he bore public censure in circumstances for which he was not responsible. Among many candidates for the directorship, only two were seriously considered by the Treasury ; their different qualifications being evenly balanced. The eventual appointment of Mr. C. J. Holmes, the brilliant artist, expert and critic (hitherto Keeper of the National Portrait Gallery), met with general approval. This was followed shortly afterwards by an invitation to Mr. Robert Witt to join the Board of Trustees. Mr. Witt's long services on behalf of the National Museums were thereby officially acknowledged if not exactly rewarded. It was subsequently determined that Mr. Holmes' appointment was to be for life, and that of Trustees for only five years. Both decisions gave satisfaction. The death of Lord Redesdale, one of the Trustees, followed shortly afterwards. Mr. J. D. Milner, for many years the indefatigable Assistant-Keeper at the National Portrait Gallery, succeeded Mr. Holmes ; a further nomination to be greeted with approval.

Among important acquisitions to the National Collection of pictures were eleven Rossettis, purchased with the assistance of a generous donation from Sir Arthur du Cros from the Rae Trustees in Liverpool. Two water-colours by the same artist were added shortly afterwards : "Lucrezia Borgia," presented by Mr. Charles Ricketts, and "The Passover," presented by the National Art Collections Fund. All the items belong to the artist's finest period, *i.e.* 1849-1869. They form as a group one of the most valuable additions ever made to the English section of the National Gallery. On the death of Mr. W. C. Alexander, the Gallery acquired, by bequest, two large Whistler family portraits. One of these, the well-known "Miss Alexander," is especially esteemed among the few masterpieces of an unequal genius. On July 3, Mr. Asher Wertheimer announced his future bequest to the nation of his nine family portraits ; in their own line, perhaps, the most celebrated achievement in the life-work of Mr. John Sargent. But the rarest acquisition in a memorable year was the altar-piece by Massaccio, the only known example of the artist remaining in England. It was painted in 1426 for the Carmelites at Pisa and is described and extolled

by Vasari: the price being 9000*l.* (half of which was provided by the National Art Collections Fund). The famous but disappointing Layard Collection from Venice (after certain litigation with the heir of the testator and certain difficulties with the Italian Government) at length passed into the custody of the Trustees. Many of the items were hung at the Gallery. Unhappily, the Trustees on their own initiative, purchased for the sum of 3000*l.* a mediocre work by Pieter de Hooch, in very bad condition. Public indignation was intense. When questions were asked in Parliament, Mr. Montagu, on behalf of the Treasury, entirely dissociated himself from the transaction. That the purchase should have taken place on the continent during war time, and that the picture was known to have been offered to, and refused by, several galleries and private collectors, exacerbated hostile criticism.

Later on in November, when Lord D'Abernon introduced on behalf of the Trustees of the National Gallery a Bill to extend their powers for the sale and loan of superfluous pictures, opponents, to support their arguments, made free and even reckless use of the Pieter de Hooch purchase. A memorandum explained the object of the measure as follows:—

1. To meet the general feeling that certain famous masterpieces in English private collections should not be sold out of the country, but should be preserved for the nation. The Bill will assist the Trustees to provide funds for the purpose by the sale of works by masters who in course of time have come to be over-represented in the national collections.

2. To establish by the loan and exchange of works of art a closer artistic intercourse with the galleries and museums in the provinces, in the colonies, and other parts of His Majesty's Dominions, and in Allied countries. The existing powers of the Gallery are quite unequal to the demands of the present day for extending the connexion with kindred art institutions at home and abroad.

A knowledge that some twenty or thirty famous masterpieces from private collections, notably the Bridgewater "Titians," might be sold to America, inspired the main proposal. The Bill was defended by Lord Curzon, who enjoyed special knowledge of the circumstances, and opposed by Lord Burnham and others. It passed the third reading in the House of Lords on December 20. Though Mr. Bonar Law subsequently stated that the New Government would not proceed with the Bill (which was regarded as abandoned), Lord Curzon corrected the impression the following day. According to authoritative information in the last days of the year, the Bill was to be presented in the Commons during the coming February. On November 23, Sir Claude Phillips led the press attack in the *Daily Telegraph*, with all the vehemence of his learning and rhetoric. He was followed by less persuasive dialecticians, including the Duke of Westminster and Sir Philip Burne-Jones. The past policy of the Trustees, the avowed intention of disposing of some of the 20,000 Turners in the National Collection, and the principle of setting aside the dispositions of donors and benefactors, were all dwelt upon by the correspondents. Mr. D. S. MacColl, Mr. Charles Ricketts and Mr. Robert Witt replied with con-

viction and vigour on behalf of the Bill. The best accounts of the controversy may be found in the *Daily Telegraph* of November 23 *et seq.* and in the *Observer* of November 26 *et seq.*

It became obvious from certain letters that a good many who contributed to the discussion had not read the Bill, or were insufficiently acquainted with the terms of Turner's will, or the circumstances in which the nation became possessed of so many examples of his work. While the discussion was being maintained with undue heat, it was announced that one of the great treasures in private collections, the Alnwick Castle Bellini, a magnificent work, had been sold to America. Another irreparable and, from a national point of view, even greater loss during the year was the sale of Gainsborough's "Mall," from the collection of Sir Audley Neeld.

Throughout December Lady Gregory, the dramatist, and Mr. Yeats, the poet, solicited the sympathy of press and public on the subject of Sir Hugh Lane's testamentary dispositions. By the duly executed and proved will certain modern French pictures have passed to the English National Gallery. By a signed, but unwitnessed codicil, these pictures were bequeathed to Dublin. It was contended by Lady Gregory, Mr. Alec Martin and others that the Trustees of the National Gallery should resign the pictures to Ireland, on the plea that morally they belong to the Dublin Gallery. Sir Hugh Lane's last intentions formed the subject of interesting correspondence in *The Times* and *Observer*. Mr. MacColl, the authorised biographer of the testator, opposed Lady Gregory's views. Whatever the issue and whatever the ethical resolution of the difficulty may be, it must be noted that Lady Gregory and some of her supporters expressed surprising views as to the functions of trustees. The Board of the National Gallery were invited to hand over to others without demur, valuable pictures acquired by a duly executed will; and when the legal impossibility of the suggestion was pointed out, they were invited, themselves, to introduce legislation to defeat interests for the protection of which they exist.

Though not officially announced, it was mentioned in the course of public controversy that a generous benefactor has offered to complete another wing to the Tate Gallery, on the conclusion of the war, for the display of modern continental schools. This will remove a long-standing reproach to the metropolis.

The Government having announced a further closing of museums as a war economy, a representative deputation of protest from the National Art College Fund and other societies was received by Mr. Asquith at Downing Street, on February 10. The Prime Minister on this occasion stated that the Victoria and Albert Museum and certain rooms of the National Gallery would remain open. Other concessions were made in favour of the Reading Room and Manuscript Department at Bloomsbury and the more popular parts of the Natural History Museum. The British Museum closed on March 1. The Wallace Gallery had closed on February 1.

At the Royal Academy the usual January display of Old Masters was abandoned. The Spring Exhibition was, however, much above the average—never a very high one. Mr. Charles Shannon, and Mr. Wm.

Orpen, carried off the honours in portraiture; Mr. D. Y. Cameron in landscape. The Chantrey purchases were Mr. Brangwyn's "Poulterer's Shop," 700*l.*; Mr. C. H. Shannon's "Lady with the Amethyst," 300*l.*; Mr. Hamo Thornycroft's "Kiss," 1250*l.* The relative paucity of anecdotal painting or sentimental war compositions connoted a more severe spirit of selection and a rarer sense of academic responsibilities. In the autumn the Academicians opened their galleries to the Society of Arts and Crafts; a tardy act, which, at any other time, would have excited more comment and surprise. While the presence of great crowds justified the experiment, the press was unfairly cold, and scarcely did justice to the efforts or achievement of the exhibitors. It must be confessed that the whole effect of the galleries, with their unusual contents, was unpleasing.

The Society, in trying to keep pace with change of taste, has contrived a compromised fashion, which nobody has adopted or is likely to adopt. In the decoration and furnishing of old and modern houses, the tendency is more and more to reproduce the classic styles of the 18th or late 17th century, more advanced householders affecting the Paris fabrics of Poiret, or the native productions of the Omega workshops (of which there was a small display at Burlington House); but the Morris and Burne-Jones conventions of the late Victorian period appear to be exhausted.

A superb piece of sculpture by Mr. Ernest Cole was quite overlooked by the critics; and a remarkable frieze by Mr. John suggested a more vigorous age than that in which the society was born.

At the Burlington Fine Arts Club in December was shown a remarkable collection of drawings by Alexander Cozens, the natural son of Peter the Great and founder of the better and more severe tradition in English water-colour painting.

The Autumn Exhibition of the New English Art Club was memorable for Mr. John's portrait of Admiral Fisher, the greatest piece of modern painting shown during the year. By an amusing coincidence, the same illustrious sitter was the subject earlier in the year of a bronze bust by Mr. Jacob Epstein. The sculptor has, perhaps for the first time, rendered modern uniform significantly in a plastic medium.

War, seldom an inspiring theme for English graphic talent, occasioned two very important exhibitions. Mr. C. R. Nevinson at the Leicester Gallery proved, by the entire sale of his war paintings, that the public has accepted, at all events for the moment, the cubist method of treatment—contrary to press prophecy in 1914. One of his works was acquired by the Contemporary Art Society. At the Goupil Gallery was exhibited a daring and brilliant work in the pre-Raphaelite convention entitled "The Kensingtons at Laventie" by Mr. Eric Kennington, a young artist, who had returned from the front. The singular effect of the technique was partly due to the picture being painted on glass. Of its sincerity and beauty there can be no doubt. Both these exhibitions indicate that modern painters are wisely leaving to the cinema attempts at realistic representation of movement or actual reconstruction of warfare. Their success, too, points to development in public taste. Two interesting experiments were made by the Government, surely

unprecedented in England, during a state of war. Mr. Muirhead Bone, the celebrated black-and-white artist, was invited to visit the front, and record his impressions in a portfolio, issued by the authorities with a preface by Sir Douglas Haig. At the Guildhall was shown, under the auspices of the Ministry of Munitions, a superb series of lithographs, illustrating the manufacture of war material, by Mr. Joseph Pennell. The Civic Arts Association was formed for the much-needed object of improving civic art, particularly such as will inevitably come into existence for memorial purposes. Advice is offered by the association to municipalities or private persons intending to erect public monuments. An exhibition of designs was held by the association in Conduit Street during July.

A singular feature of the Sale Rooms was that the average of prices was higher than before the war. Various explanations of this phenomenon, not easy to test, were forthcoming. While no great masterpieces were offered at auction, 5250*l.* was paid for Landseer's "Monarch of the Glen," this being purchased by a well-known firm of distillers. The record price in pictures was 6510*l.* on May 19 for a Murillo; the record in other objects being 24,000*l.* for a three-row pearl necklace. It was observed, notably at the Barker and Barrett's sales, that mid-Victorian pictures tended to recover their much-diminished value. The decline of Burne-Jones was illustrated in the sale at Norbury Park on September 11, when the "Bath of Venus," an important work, fell for 250 guineas.

On December 5 the historic firm of Christies reached its 150th birthday.

Obituary.—On June 28 Mr. Stirling Lee, the sculptor, chiefly known for his panels on St. George's Hall, Liverpool. On July 12 the venerable academician, Mr. James Sant, aged 96; and on October 3 Sir James Linton, President of the Royal Institute of Painters in Water-Colour.

On June 14, by a resolution of Convocation, Oxford University suspended the office of the Slade Professorship (Mr. Selwyn Image having retired), and appropriated the stipend to other purposes.

II. DRAMA.

Mr. Algernon Blackwood, so well known as a master of occult fiction, opened the year's drama at the Kingsway Theatre with his fairy play, "The Starlight Express." It was not a success in spite of Sir Edward Elgar's really beautiful music and of the clever acting of the interpreters, among whom Mr. O. B. Clarence and Miss Mercia Cameron distinguished themselves. The play was adapted from one of Mr. Blackwood's stories, but unfortunately the very qualities that make for Mr. Blackwood's success as a storyteller, his flowing style and brisk cicerone's manner, get in his way as a dramatist. The piece ran for only a few days. Mrs. Clifford Mills' new play, "The Baskers," was produced in the early days of January at the St. James's, and although possessed of much less intrinsic interest than Mr. Blackwood's attempt to put fairy-land on the stage, had an immediate success with the public. Sir George Alexander knows his audience as few managers do, and impersonated to their great delight, and with his accustomed graceful facility, the sort

of duke familiar in a certain class of literature. The "basker" of the piece, he developed a healthy natural indolence to the point of lethargy, and carried his motto of *nolo ducere* so far as to be willing to give his estates and the young lady with whom he was in love to his rascally cousin. But what makes "The Basker" really worth noting is the fact that it provided Miss Genevieve Ward with the opportunity of returning to the stage. She made a magnificent dowager-duchess, and in spite of her age, nothing of her early fire and vigour appeared to have been lost.

During February four new plays were presented on the London boards, of which one at least, Mr. Somerset Maugham's "Caroline," forms a serious addition to the literature of our stage. "Caroline" is the lightest, airiest, frothiest extravaganza of a comedy conceivable. Caroline Ashley, a separated wife, is passionately loved by Robert Oldham. He spends every evening with her, revelling in the sweet melancholy of what might have been. Suddenly, however, she becomes a widow. Providence, always weak in the presence of temptation, has answered Robert's prayers. This answered prayer is the tragedy of the lovers, and the pivot of Mr. Maugham's comedy. Each loved, sighing for the other; neither can bear the thought of the matrimonial bond. Robert can only love on condition that the object of his love is unattainable. Clearly, then, Caroline, who has no idea of dispensing with his incense, must at once get married to some one who will understand the situation. She fixes on her doctor as the victim. That astute man finds an unexpected way out of the dilemma by discovering, on elaborately contrived evidence, that Mr. Ashley is still alive, and Caroline and her adorer happily resume the attitude of the lovers on Keats' Grecian Urn. So delicately satirical, so slight a motive requires correspondingly light and delicate dialogue to sustain it. This is just what Mr. Maugham supplies. The dialogue of "Caroline" is by far the best that he has written, in fact by far the best that has been heard on the London stage since the days of Wilde's plays. Miss Irene Vanbrugh was very happily suited in the title-rôle. Miss Lillah McCarthy was excellent as a sentimental friend, who insisted on joining the lovers' hands over Mr. Ashley's grave, and Mr. Dion Boucicault (who produced the play at the New Theatre) was capital as the wise doctor. "Mrs. Pretty and the Premier," produced at His Majesty's by Mr. Bouchier, was a not badly constructed play dealing with Australian political life on lines familiar to the London playgoer. Miss Kyrle Bellew was hardly up to the rather difficult part of "Mrs. Pretty," and although Mr. Bouchier was a very effective Labour Prime Minister and the play as a whole well acted, the venture did not succeed in running very long. At the Garrick a new and powerful melodrama of the Far North, called "Tiger's Cub," was a great popular success. This was due mainly to the excellent acting of Miss Madge Titheradge and Mr. Charles Glenny.

March saw the production at the Savoy of Mr. Hackett's "The Barton Mystery." This play, better written than constructed, afforded Mr. H. B. Irving the opportunity to create one of those characters in which he excels, that of Beverly, half clairvoyant, half charlatan. It was a wonderful performance, and no one but Mr. Irving could have

done it. The play had a long and well-deserved run. Sir James Barrie's "A Kiss for Cinderella" was presented this month at Wyndham's. It was Barrie in his most fantastic and sentimental mood. A little twenny-maid dreams she is Cinderella and dances at a Court Ball before the King and Queen. Subsequently she becomes the matron of a hospital for the wounded, and marries a policeman who had figured in her dream as the Prince. Miss Hilda Trevelyan rendered the part beautifully, and Mr. Du Maurier was very effective as the Prince-policeman.

Real romantic melodrama in costume is always attractive, and Mr. Justin Huntly McCarthy's "Stand and Deliver," produced during the following month at His Majesty's by Mr. Bouchier, was no exception to the rule. The hero of this piece is Claude Duval, the highwayman. As a highwayman Mr. Bouchier did not shine in any special degree, but he is a highly accomplished actor and acquitted himself well of the part. The staging was certainly good, and the dresses, particularly a pale-gilt ball-dress worn by lovely Miss Kyrle Bellew, too magnificent for words. A new Scottish Comedy, "Kitty Mackay," belonging to the "Buntz—Peg o' My Heart" School, was successfully presented this month at the Queen's, Miss Molly McIntyre playing the title-rôle charmingly. The best play produced in April was perhaps Mr. James Forbes's "The Show Shop," in which we saw real actors behind the scenes revealing with startling candour those apparently ill-adapted methods by which they produce their effects. Lady Tree gave a fine broadly conceived reading of a stage-struck mamma.

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's "Mayor of Troy," adapted from his well-known story, was presented at the Haymarket in May. Its run was short, and it was soon replaced by "Fishpingle," by Mr. Vachell. "Fishpingle" is one of the best plays that Mr. Vachell has given us, and Mr. Henry Ainley was wonderful in the title-rôle as a squire's illegitimate elder brother who has become the family butler. About the same time versatile Mr. Vachell offered "Lady Penelope" at the St. James's. This, however, was a failure. In these days came from New York "Daddy Long-Legs," with Miss Renée Kelly as an unnaturally bright "orphan," who after much misunderstanding marries her guardian. "Daddy Long-Legs" was a charming play, very well acted, and obtained a well-deserved success.

Towards the end of June Mr. Harold Brighouse's "Hobson's Choice," described as a "Lancashire comedy," was presented at the Apollo. It was the best new play of the year, with the possible exception of "Caroline," and extremely well acted by Miss Edith Goodall and a most capable company. Mr. Stanley Houghton's mantle has fallen on no unworthy successor. Mr. Maltby's "The Rotters," at the Garrick, was very amusing as a skit on the "Manchester School" of drama. It was during June that Mr. Eadie produced his "Disraeli," only remarkable for his own very clever impersonation.

Mr. Du Maurier produced in September a capital little comedy by Mr. Dion Clayton Calthrop, called "The Old Country." He played the part of the retiring American excellently, and Miss Rosalie Toller was an admirable rustic schoolmistress. The little play was sentimental in tone

and well composed. Mr. Dion Boucicault brought out a new venture this month in the shape of "*Her Husband's Wife*," by Mr. A. E. Thomas, an American author. It was a bright little comedy, and Miss Marie Löhr distinguished herself greatly. Another American comedy (produced at the Playhouse) was "*The Misleading Lady*," by Messrs. Goodard and Dicky. It was an immediate success. The most important feature was the impersonation of a lunatic who thinks himself Napoleon by Mr. Weedon Grossmith. A truly wonderful performance, comic and pathetic by turns.

Little else of note was produced during the autumn season. "Mr. Jubilee Drax," at the Haymarket, ran for some time, being an amusing variant of the "Spoof" detective play due to the busy pen of Mr. Vachell, and another comedy by Mr. Brighouse, "*The Clock Goes Round*," which was a complete failure, partly owing to the unsuitability of the cast selected. Of the many new plays produced during the year, only two, Mr. Maugham's "*Caroline*," and Mr. Brighouse's "*Hobson's Choice*," can really be placed in the first rank, and close on the heels of these two comes Mr. Vachell's "*Fishpingle*." Apart from these three plays nothing of real literary significance was added to the British drama in 1916.

III. MUSIC.

Although, as in the previous year, the war cast a lengthy shadow over musical activity in England in 1916, more especially in the provinces, yet the actual number of public performances was very large, and towards the end of the year the average weekly list of concerts rose to almost the height of that in pre-war days. Nor was the quality of the performances substantially inferior, but in special interest there was something to seek in that nearly all concert promoters avoided any music that was not of the most familiar type. Again, as in 1915, music-lovers owed a deep debt to Sir Thomas Beecham, without whose activity the whole musical year in London would have been of vastly inferior order, while in the provinces there would have been infinitely less of concerts and opera. Thus, after the disbanding of the Scottish Orchestra in the autumn the only orchestral concerts in Scotland were those directed by Beecham; and we shall see in course of this record how much Londoners were indebted to that eminent conductor.

In the beginning of the year Beecham began yet one more season of opera in English, thus carrying on the seasons of the previous year which he had started in conjunction with Robert Courtneidge at the Shaftesbury Theatre. Now he spread his net rather more widely than before and included in his repertory two new operas of native origin; the older, familiar repertory of Puccini operas ("*Manon Lescaut*" being staged for the first time in English), "*Il Trovatore*," "*Tales of Hoffmann*," and so on, was of course chiefly relied upon, for Beecham had not only to augment his company of competent and self-supporting singers, but also to found an audience which could be relied upon for more or less permanent support. Having achieved something of this he boldly took the plunge, and produced first Sir Charles Villiers Stanford's version of Sheridan's "*The*

Critic," and a little later Miss Ethel Smyth's opera (based upon a familiar story by W. W. Jacobs), "The Boatswain's Mate." Strangely enough both these operas, by our most experienced operatic composers, owed more to their librettos than to the intrinsic merit of their music. Musically both were of uncommon skill in the making. But whereas the fun of "The Critic" of Sheridan was possibly enhanced by the music if only for those who had as wide a knowledge of the musical classics as the composer himself and so could appreciate the various quotations and imitations, in the case of Miss Smyth's opera the incongruity of styles, which made the work now "grand" opera, anon comedy opera, detracted from its chance of appeal. It was written with a view to production in a German theatre, which may explain this. The former, however, was a breezy affair that might reasonably have been expected to hold its own for longer than would appear to be the case. Both operas were splendidly staged, by Hugo Rumbold, and played with excellent and somewhat unexpected humour by, among others, Frank Mullings (Don Whiskerandos), Caroline Hatchard (Tilburina), Lena Maitland, Frederick Ranalow, etc., in the one case; and by Courtice Pounds, Rosina Buckman, and Ranalow in the other. During this early season Beecham staged also a little work by Elgar entitled "A Voice in the Desert," the poem, by Emile Cammaerts, inspired by the Belgian atrocities, being recited by the Belgian actor Liten.

At the close of this season at the Shaftesbury Theatre, Beecham transferred his entire opera business to his own theatre, the Aldwych, where for almost the remainder of the year performances took place continuously, save for two brief breaks, during one of which his company gave a five weeks' season in Manchester. Again the repertory was much as before, but it was constantly being added to. Verdi's "Otello," in Italian, was added, with August Bouilliez, a fine Belgian baritone, Mignon Nevada, and Webster Millar in the cast, the first-named also taking the title-rôle in a French version of "Boris Godounov." All the other operas were sung in English; they included "Tristan and Isolde," of which many distinguished performances were given with Frank Mullings, Rosina Buckman, and Radford in the cast. Bach's "Phoebus and Pan" was staged also in a version made by Beecham; "Il Seraglio" was revived as were Gounod's "Faust" and "Romeo and Juliet." Among other English singers who took part in these seasons whose names should be recorded were Jeanne Brola, Doris Woodall, Edith Evans, Edith Clegg, Bessie Tyas, Blamey, Gerald O'Brien, and Frederic Austin, all of whom did admirable work, while the conductors (several of whom were now receiving practically their first experience) were Beecham, Percy Pitt, Julius Harrison, Eugene Goossens, junr., Geoffrey Toye, and Buesst. Later in the year "Samson and Delila" made a great success, as also did "Aida."

At the very end of the year an opera entitled "Young England," which dealt with English life in the Elizabethan times, the book by Captain Basil Hood, the music by Hubert Bath and George Clutsam, was produced at Daly's Theatre after a trial at Birmingham.

Considerable difficulty was found in keeping the Royal (and somewhat ancient) Philharmonic Society on its legs. It was founded in 1813, and

for this reason or excuse many deemed it well-nigh obligatory to preserve it. But in the autumn Beecham once more came to the rescue, became almost autocrat in the direction, not, however, to maintain the society for the reason specified, but because he thought that some contemporary benefit might accrue from its survival, and a season was duly inaugurated. The late Secretary, Stanley Hawley, had died since the last season ; when Beecham, therefore, came upon the scenes, he brought with him his opera manager, Donald Baylis, and at the end of the year there was every prospect of the Royal Philharmonic Society developing into an extremely useful modern affair with renewed vigour. A good deal of modern Russian music found a place in the programmes, but native works by Balfour Gardiner, Arnold Bax, Frank Bridge, Mackenzie, F. Corder, Sterndale Bennett (whose centenary it was), and Norman O'Neill were heard. Among the artists who appeared were Mignon Nevada, Stralia, Ben Davies, Fanny Davies, Myra Hess, Pachmann, Arthur Rubinstein, Rumshchisky, Sapellnikov, Ohemet, Saunders, Ysaye, Lionel Tertis, Fransella, and D. Wood. The London Symphony Orchestra completed the season begun in 1915 and began another last autumn. In the earlier months the conductors were Beecham, Mlynarski, Safonoff, Arbos, and Henry Wood ; the chief work played was Berlioz's "Romeo and Juliet" symphony, but native music by Delius, Parry, Elgar, Bantock, and Ethel Smyth was played. On rather broader lines were the programmes of the New Queen's Hall Symphony concerts, conducted by Sir Henry Wood. They were twelve in number, and the programmes, made up largely of familiar music, included César Franck's symphony, of which a noteworthy performance was given, while Albert Sammons played Elgar's violin concerto in absolute perfection. The autumn season of Promenade concerts was held as usual, but whereas it was originally thought that one month would suffice, ultimately another month was added. At the Royal Albert Hall the Sunday concerts, under the direction of Mr. Landon Ronald, pursued their accustomed way without adding much to our musical stature, and in the same building the Royal Choral Society gave eight concerts, at one of which Verdi's Requiem was sung. Sir Frederick Bridge was the conductor.

The Elgar Festival organised by Clara Butt for the British Red Cross, which took place in Queen's Hall in the summer, should be recorded if only because of its immense success. The central feature was a series of six brilliant performances of Elgar's "Dream of Gerontius," each performance being preceded by the singing of one or other of two new small but interesting settings by Elgar of poems by Laurence Binyon, connected with the war. Madame Clara Butt brought the Huddersfield Choir to London, and the net financial result amounted to several thousands of pounds. Those old institutions the Ballad Concerts, Chappell's and Boosey's, ran their accustomed course, the former instituting a vast improvement by means of a charming small orchestra which played lighter music under the direction of Aleck Maclean. Recitals were not so numerous as in old times, but Pachmann, Hambourg, Adela Verne, Moisevich, Murdoch, and others appeared. No praise is too strong to express of the London String Quartet, a very fine organisation which gave several series of chamber concerts at each of which they

played a composition by a native composer. The London Trio, the Philharmonic Quartet, Holbrooke, Dunhill, and others also gave many chamber concerts, as did Isidore de Lara (about 600 in two years), who introduced several new works.

Periodically there arose propaganda against the performance of any kind of German music during the war, but it generally came to naught when it was pointed out that if this idea were followed strictly and logically there would be no performances of "Elijah" by Mendelssohn (a Berlin Jew), or of "Messiah" by Handel (a Saxon from Hallé).

Death was busy. In England the greatest blows occurred through the death of William Samuëll, a young operatic baritone of amazingly generous prospects. His career was short, he was but thirty or so when he died, but it was pregnant; and Sir Joseph Beecham, father of Sir Thomas. It was owing to the father's magnificent keenness for the best in music and especially in opera that his son was enabled to put into execution his manifold operatic schemes. The number of commonplace "charity" or war concerts was curtailed by the wise official enactment that the consent had to be obtained from the charity for whose benefit the proposed concert was to be held : and the compulsory registration of such charities.

FINANCE AND COMMERCE IN 1916.

SINCE practice precedes science in economic as well as in other departments of human activity, scientific financial and commercial knowledge will have undergone a great expansion by the time that peace returns, for since the war began, and especially in 1916, new financial and commercial operations were carried out, some of them of first-rate importance. There was, indeed, a perfect riot of precedents, and consequently comparison with previous years is often quite impracticable.

The money market, for example, was completely under the influence of the Bank of England and the Treasury in financing the war. Thus wholly artificial conditions prevailed and are likely to prevail during the war. There was a large turnover of credit, and, owing to the actions of those responsible for Government policy, high rates ruled throughout the year for loans. On July 13, owing, as it proved, to a temporary stringency in New York, the Bank Rate was raised from 5 to 6 per cent., and although the position in New York soon became easier, the 6 per cent. rate was still retained in the belief that it would contribute in no small degree to the maintenance of the American exchange. Bankers generally were opposed to this policy, on the ground that the maintenance of American exchange could have been achieved in a different way, without raising the rates for money here and thus increasing the whole cost of financing the war. Consequently, short loans averaged 4*l.* 12*s.* 8*d.* per cent., as compared with 2*l.* 18*s.* per cent. in 1915. But the market generally was well controlled, and, while there was never any stringency there was no plethora of credit, for an arrangement was reached by which the Bank of England took surplus money from the clearing banks at fixed rates for short periods. The system of selling Treasury Bills at the bank daily was continued throughout the year, and by this method there was provided the bulk of the finances required to carry on the war. At the end of the year there were outstanding 1,115,149,000*l.* of these bills as compared with 380,381,000*l.* at the beginning. During the first quarter of the year the selling rate for Treasury Bills was 5 per cent. for all maturities, but on March 24 there was a reduction, 4½ per cent. being quoted for three months' bills, 4¼ per cent. for six and nine months' bills, and 5 per cent. for twelve months' bills. Just before the close of the second quarter (June 16) the flat rate of 5 per cent. was re-established for all maturities. Following the raising of the Bank Rate from 5 to 6 per cent. in July, there was an advance in Treasury Bills rates, "threes" being raised to 5½ per cent., "sixes" to 5¾ per cent., and yearlings to 6 per cent., the nine months' bill being dropped. These rates remained in force until Sep-

tember 27, when $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was fixed for all maturities, and this remained the rate for the remainder of the year.

A large amount of money for the war was also raised in sales of 5 per cent. Exchequer Bonds running for various periods ranging from three up to rather more than five years. However, in September, owing to the great increase in the floating debt and to a less keen demand for short-dated securities, the 5 per cent. Exchequer Bonds were replaced by 6 per cent. Exchequer Bonds having a currency of three years. Many financial authorities regarded this step as imprudent, for although a British Government security carrying such a high rate of interest naturally proved popular, it established a new standard of investment values which accentuated the depreciation in stocks bearing fixed rates of interest. At the end of one year the Bonds were withdrawn from sale pending the issue of the great new War Loan which was floated on January 12, 1917. War Expenditure Certificates—in effect two-year Treasury Bills—which had yielded 29,856,000*l.* during the year, were withdrawn at the same time. The War Savings Certificates, representing a real tax-free loan, designed to appeal to the small investor, proved very popular and realised by the end of the year 40,250,000*l.* The discount market was, of course, dominated by the rates fixed for Treasury Bills; rates for ordinary commercial bills were only slightly higher than those for Treasury Bills, for they were much sought after by neutrals.

There was a marked recovery in the turnover of money during the year, an increase of 1,867,321,000*l.* being reported by the London Clearing House. This figure compared with a decrease of 1,257,323,000*l.* in 1915, and the total has only been exceeded on two occasions before, namely, in 1912 and 1913, which were periods of great activity in finance and trade. The foreign exchanges fluctuated less violently than in 1915, and they moved, on the whole, in favour of this country. The New York rate advanced during the year from $\$4.74\frac{1}{2}$ c. per *l.* to $\$4.76\frac{1}{2}$ c., which was due to the raising of further British loans in the United States, and the Government mobilisation of American and other securities held in this country. The French Exchange remained at a high level, and closed six centimes higher on balance at 27 francs 79 centimes per *l.*; the Dutch Exchange was raised from 10.80 florins up to 11.67 $\frac{1}{2}$ florins, while the rouble appreciated to some extent, the Petrograd Exchange being quoted finally at Rs. 156 per 10*l.* as against Rs. 160, mainly as the result of the placing in London from time to time of batches of Russian credit bills.

In August the Bank of England discontinued the practice of publishing the daily movements of gold. Very substantial exports were made to the United States, and the Bank of France arranged to lend this country a large part of its stock for the period of the war. This was used, to a considerable extent, to meet the American drain, and at the end of the year the gold stock of the Bank of England amounted to 54,304,915*l.*, an increase of about three millions on the year.

It will have been inferred that the year must have been a very profitable period, as far as gross profits were concerned, for the banking community. The Bank of England in allowing the joint stock banks

4 to 4½, and subsequently 5 per cent., on deposits, at three days' notice, automatically fixed the level below which the banks naturally declined to lend. Consequently the margins of profit were excellent; that on day-to-day money was 14s. per cent. as against 3s. per cent. in 1915, and that on loans to customers 3 per cent. as against the usual 2½ per cent. Moreover, the deposits at the banks rose to unprecedented figures, partly owing to inflation and also to the transfer of large amounts of foreign money attracted here by the high rates of interest. As these deposits provide the basis upon which a bank conducts its business, it follows that profits must have been unusually large. This indeed was the case; the London City and Midland, the premier bank of the country, reported at December 31 deposits amounting to 174,620,724*l.* against 147,750,702*l.*, and an increase in its profits of over half a million. Still, the increases in profits of banks were not reflected in dividends, which were on the same level as in 1915. This was because the very factors which produced the higher profits resulted in a further depreciation in investments, and in many cases the increased amounts which had to be appropriated for this purpose exceeded the increase in profits. Thus shareholders of the banks derived no benefit from the increase in profits beyond a strengthening of hidden reserves.

Although earnings were very appreciably increased by the great advance in deposits, bankers were not wholly pleased with the position. To some extent the abnormal growth was due to the very large subscriptions to the war loans made by themselves. These subscriptions were disbursed in the form of payments to Government contractors, who, in their turn, paid the amounts received into their banking accounts. The banks' deposits were thus automatically swollen by, approximately, the amount of their subscriptions. For this reason, bankers wanted to see the public subscribe to the New War Loan of 1917 far more heavily than before, for when payment is made from a customer's deposit inflation is avoided.

With one exception, namely, the final abolition of minimum prices, conditions of business on the Stock Exchange underwent no change in 1916. The severe restrictions imposed on the transaction of business by the emergency rules drawn up for the re-opening of the House on January 4, 1915, were not relaxed, and consequently 1916 was another lean year for its members. There was a further depreciation in fixed interest-bearing stocks. High-grade stocks closed at about the lowest points of the year, but the losses as regards those securities which were not subject to the minimum price restriction in 1916 were less formidable than those of 1915. This shows that the heavy falls recorded in those securities released from fixed limits during the year represented not one year's depreciation but the depreciation that had accumulated since the beginning of the war. According to a calculation made in the Bankers' Magazine, there was a depreciation in 1916 in 387 representative securities of 149,000,000, as against 207,000,000 in 1915.

The year's depreciation was most marked in British and Foreign Government securities. The heavy fall in fixed interest-bearing securities had the effect of causing the tide of capital to flow more in

the direction of speculative investments where the chances of depreciation were partially offset by prospects of appreciation, considerably increased by the large profits many companies secured as the result of the advance in prices of commodities. Consequently, substantial improvements were recorded in the speculative departments. Copper shares showed an average appreciation of about 30 per cent. Industrial and Commercial shares a rise of 12 per cent.; shipping securities an improvement of 25 per cent.; munition-making companies' securities an average advance of 20 per cent.; and miscellaneous mining shares a rise of nearly 40 per cent.

But the great event of the year, as regards the Stock Exchange—an event quite without precedent—was the Government's mobilisation of securities for the purpose of regulating the Exchange between this country and the United States. This mobilisation—a kind of wealth conscription—took two forms, the purchase of securities for re-sale in America, and the borrowing of securities to be used as collateral security for loans in the United States. The object in both cases was to acquire dollars in America wherewith to pay for the enormous purchases by the Allies in the United States. The purchase scheme was first brought into operation in the latter part of 1915, but the borrowing scheme did not become effective until the end of March, when what was subsequently described as "Scheme A" was put into operation. Under this scheme securities, chiefly American, were borrowed for two years, in return for an annual payment of $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. per annum on the face value of the securities deposited. Power to sell the securities was reserved by the Treasury, in the unlikely event of its wanting to do so. In August a fresh scheme, called "Scheme B," was inaugurated, owing partly to a falling off in the supply of American securities. This scheme, which provided for the borrowing of foreign, colonial, and British Railway stocks for five years, in return for the payment of $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. per annum, in addition to the dividends, was a great improvement on the earlier scheme, for it ensured a guaranteed minimum price, plus 5 per cent. to be paid to the lender in case of sale by the Treasury. Under Scheme A the price realised at the time of sale, plus $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. only was to be paid to the lender. On December 16, Scheme A was withdrawn, but the power of sale reserved to the lender under it was also given to lenders under Scheme B, for practically all securities. In order to induce holders to sell or deposit acceptable securities, the Treasury imposed a tax of 2s. in the pound on income derived from the securities it was willing to purchase, but exemption from the tax was given if the securities were deposited on loan. The scheme was a marked success, and contributed in no small degree to the maintenance of the American Exchange.

Comparisons of figures for oversea commerce with previous years are vitiated by the withholding of particulars of certain imports and exports for Government account, and also by the great rise in prices of all commodities, including of course all food-stuffs. The outstanding features in 1916 were the great advance in the values of imports and the further satisfactory improvement in the figures of exports. In some respects the increase in imports is to be regretted. The value of the imports

amounted to 949,000,000*l.*, as compared with 852,000,000*l.* in 1915, and with 767,000,000*l.* in 1913, the last complete year of peace. The increase in the imports over those of 1915 was thus 11·4 per cent. Exports represented last year a value of 507,000,000*l.* as compared with 385,000,000*l.* in 1915 and 525,000,000*l.* in 1913, the rise last year over the figures for 1915 amounting to as much as 31·6 per cent. Taking into account the figures of re-exports, the adverse balance last year amounted to 345,000,000*l.* as compared with 368,000,000*l.* in 1915, thus showing a substantial and satisfactory reduction. Still, the adverse balance, *i.e.* the excess of imports over exports was only 170,000,000*l.* in 1914 and 134,000,000*l.* in 1913.

The influence of high prices on these figures is indicated by the very heavy falling off in the tonnage of ships engaged in foreign trade which entered the ports of the United Kingdom last year. The amount declined by no less than 3,664,000 tons to 30,059,000 tons in 1915. As compared with 1914, the decline was 13,000,000 tons.

Still the rise in prices was not confined to imported commodities alone. The English *Gazette* average price of wheat at the end of the year was 75*s.* 10*d.* a quarter, as compared with 54*s.* 9*d.* at the close of 1915, showing a rise during the year of 21*s.* a quarter, or as much as 38 per cent. It is true that the rise in the prices of North America was actually larger, owing to the comparative failure of the crops. Thus No. 1 Northern Manitoba closed at 91*s.* a quarter, as against 66*s.* at the end of 1915, the rise representing nearly 38 per cent., or practically the same percentage increase as in the case of English wheat.

The shipping problem bulked very largely in the year. Probably for the first time the public have, during the war, realised the extreme importance of shipping to the country. Most people had previously given little attention to it and had taken shipping for granted. During the past two and a half years, and especially in 1916, the public gradually came to an appreciation of the immense value of the mercantile marine as an auxiliary to the Fleet, and it has also had to realise that the supply of many commodities, a large proportion of which is regarded as essential, is entirely dependent on an adequate supply of tonnage to bring them from the producing countries. Happily, when war broke out, there was a surplus of tonnage; this was gradually decreased, and the time came when the amount was very inadequate. The authorities have had to face a position ever increasing in difficulty. The necessity of employing all British tonnage to the greatest possible advantage of the country was obvious, irrespective of private interests. During 1916 the control over shipping gradually increased. In January Mr. Runciman, then President of the Board of Trade, appointed what was described as a shipping control committee, presided over by Lord Curzon and containing three experts on transport questions. This appointment followed a very strong agitation in the Press for better control. Gradually more and more steamers were requisitioned by the Government to carry food-stuffs for the Allies, and in October the appointment of a Royal Commission to control the importation of all wheat meant that further large amounts of tonnage would be put directly into the service of the State. In June a scheme for limiting

the price of British coal imported into France through the Channel and Atlantic ports was put into operation, and in October a similar scheme was instituted for Italy and the Mediterranean ports of France. These schemes provided for maximum prices for the coal at the pit's mouth, stipulated charges for the middlemen, and maximum rates of freight, but they were only partially successful in achieving the objects for which they were devised, and it became clear by the end of the year that very considerable amendments would have to be effected. There seemed, however, throughout the year to be ground for the charge that there were too many authorities, some of them apparently overlapping each other, and that more centralised control was needed. With the formation of Mr. Lloyd George's Government in December, a Shipping Minister was appointed, with the title of Shipping Controller. Sir Joseph Maclay, a successful Glasgow shipowner, who was comparatively little known to the English public, was selected for the post. His functions were to see that all shipping was put to the utmost possible use in the interests of the nation, and his main work will obviously belong to the record of 1917 and later years. One of his first actions deserves, however, mention here, namely, the preparation of a programme for building a large number of cargo steamers on a standardised model for account of the State. Attention had been called in *The Times* early last year to the development of the standardised system in the United States and to its possibilities in this country in the present emergency. Shortly afterwards a company, backed by many of the leading shipping lines, was formed for building vessels on standard models at Chepstow, River Wye. The scheme provided for the laying out of a garden city with the object, presumably, of attracting skilled labour from the existing shipbuilding centres of the United Kingdom. The scheme was handicapped from the outset by the difficulties of securing the necessary labour, which must be expected to continue during the war, but there can be no doubt that its elaboration was of immense value in bringing the question of standardisation to the front.

The scarcity of tonnage brought about a further rise in freights which rose to unprecedented levels. Large as the earnings were of British shipping, the profits of neutral owners were still larger, since they were under no such restrictions as to trades as were British vessels. The position of neutral shipping has during the war been enormously strengthened. It must be remembered that although most neutral Governments have now enforced some form of excess-profit taxation, these foreign taxes are far below the taxation of 60 per cent. of excess profits, together with a heavy ordinary income tax on the remaining portion, which is now imposed on British owners. A good deal of harm was done during the year by the distribution of huge dividends by a number of cargo steamship owners and also by the sales of whole fleets, or single ships, at fabulous prices. The earnings of the liner companies were never on the same great scale, and the companies have seen the importance of putting by large sums in reserve to meet competition after the war, or to invest in new tonnage. The question of the neutrals undoubtedly complicated the position and militated against the taking over of the whole of the British mercantile marine by the State on the same

lines as the railways of the country were taken over by the State early in the war, and the coal mines were brought under complete Government control at the end of 1916.

Marine underwriters performed a useful service to the nation in providing facilities for war insurance on ships and cargoes. The State schemes were of immense value in assisting commerce, but they applied mainly to British ships and their cargoes. A very great amount of insurance on British ships and cargoes, which for some reason or other did not come within the scope of the Government schemes, was placed in the open market, and also enormous sums on foreign ships and their cargoes. The rates on British ships and cargoes were always subject to the influence of the low rates quoted by the British Government, but the rates on neutrals on occasion rose to high levels. Marine insurance was inextricably mixed up with war insurance, owing to such facts as the suppression of the usual aids to navigation and the postponement of repair work, the cost of which rose steadily. Until the last quarter of the year losses owing to what were regarded as marine perils seemed by no means above the average; but in the closing weeks of the year there were a number of serious disasters both to liners and cargo vessels, which must have affected unfavourably some of the underwriting accounts. At the close of the year a concession was made to underwriters in respect of excess-profit taxation, the decision of the Board of Referees being that the percentage standard of profits should be calculated on the capital at stake, which is to be taken to be equivalent to the net premium income of the year.

The year promised to be a fairly satisfactory one for fire insurance offices. Premiums, in view of the rise in prices of commodities, should have been well maintained and losses did not appear to be extraordinarily heavy. At home the cost of the principal fires was estimated at 3,300,400*l.*, which compared with a loss of 4,205,100*l.* in 1915. This improvement is the more satisfactory in view of the Zeppelin raids. British offices are very largely interested in insurance in North America, and there the estimated loss increased by 5,400,000*l.* to 42,000,000*l.* By far the most serious fire in the United States occurred in New York harbour at the end of July, when damage was done to the extent of 2,200,000*l.* Another serious fire affecting British offices was that which occurred at Bergen, Norway, in January, costing about 2,000,000*l.*

Life assurance naturally was severely tested. Heavy depreciation in security values, the rise in the income-tax, mortality among the immense numbers of men who had insured as civilians and joined the forces, and the difficulty in securing new business owing to both the occupation of a large proportion of the civilian population in the Army and to the reduction in the staffs, were all unfavourable factors. Some twenty-five offices announced their valuations, either annual or quinquennial, during the year, and many of them decided to postpone their bonus decisions or to declare none. With the immediate outlook so uncertain such action can be understood, and it does not follow, of course, that in the long run many of the policy-holders will be any the worse off. One or two offices maintained their valuations and bonus distributions on precisely the same scale as previously. The war has

well illustrated the advantage of insuring at the earliest possible moment, for the great majority of those who insured before the war received policies free from all restrictions. Practically all contracts issued during the war to those of military age have specifically excluded the war risk, and to include this risk high additional rates, such as 20 per cent., or even more, were quoted. The experience obviously might be used by some in favour of non-participating policies, since these have been absolutely unaffected. In spite of the passing of many bonuses, the accounts have again indicated the strength of the foundations on which British life assurance and, indeed, the whole finance of the country indisputably rests.

OBITUARY

OF

EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1916.

JANUARY.

1. **Sir George Scott Robertson, K.C.S.I.**, was born in 1852 and came of well-known families on both sides. He was educated at Westminster Hospital Medical School, joining the Indian Medical Service in 1878. From 1880 to 1888 he was Civil Surgeon of various districts in the United Provinces. In the latter year he was transferred to the Foreign Department for employment as Agency Surgeon in Gilgit, on the Cashmir frontier. But it was in 1895 that he became known as the hero of the siege of Chitral. He had been entrusted with a political mission to Chitral; the object being to control the external affairs in a direction friendly to British interests. The siege began in March, and the position became very critical for Robertson and his force before it was relieved on April 20. For his gallantry and the determination of his defence he was created K.C.S.I., and was made British Agent in Gilgit. He retired from official life in 1899. He entered Parliament as Liberal member for Central Bradford in 1906 and held the seat until his death.

— **Ellen Lady Wilson**, the daughter of Brigadier-General Warren Hastings Firth, was born in 1820. In 1842 she married Major Archdale Wilson, then Superintendent of the Indian gun-foundry at Cossipur. For the part her husband played in the siege of Delhi a baronetcy was bestowed on him as Sir Archdale Wilson of Delhi, and the G.C.B. Lady Wilson survived her husband forty-one years.

4. **M. Francis Charmes** was born in 1848, and became one of the greatest journalists of the Third Republic. In 1880 the Government

offered him the post of Assistant-Director in the Political Department at the Quai d'Orsay, and in 1885 he was appointed Director of this department. This appointment he held until 1899 when he went to the Chamber of Deputies. His political career ended in 1900. In 1898 he began his political writings in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*; in 1906 the editor of the review died and in the following year Francis Charmes succeeded him.

5. **Sir Herewald Wake**, who was the twelfth of his line, was descended from Herewald le Wac, more popularly known as Herewald the Wake, son of Leofric, Lord of Bourne. The Wakes were summoned to Parliament as far back as 1295. The late baronet was Deputy-Lieutenant for Northamptonshire and for some time member of the Northamptonshire County Council. He married in 1874 the youngest daughter of Sir Edward St. Aubyn, Bt., of St. Michael's Mount. The title passes to their eldest son, born in 1876.

6. **Sir Frederick William Hewitt, M.V.O.**, was born in 1857. He was educated at Cambridge, where he graduated M.D. He was anaesthetist to King Edward as well as to King George and received the M.V.O. in 1902. He wrote widely on his subject, and his work "Anaesthetics and their Administration" is a standard work.

— **Sir Samuel Way**, born in 1836, became one of the best known men in South Australia. He began his public career in 1875 as Attorney-General and afterwards filled many positions, and on ten occasions he administered the Government during changes in the Governorship. He was created a Privy

Councillor in 1897 and a Baronet in 1899. He leaves no heir.

9. **Lord Burnham** (Edward Levy Lawson), who was of Jewish extraction, was born in 1833. He was educated at University College School, where he had a brilliant record. He went straight from school to help his father conduct the *Daily Telegraph*, which was the first daily newspaper to be sold at a penny. It at once became a great success by its appeal to a very large section of the people, and the future Lord Burnham soon became the editor of the new penny paper. From this date, 1855, until 1903 he was the guiding influence in its direction, and during these fifty years the journal had constantly to adapt itself to the enormous changes that took place during that period. In 1892 he was made a Baronet, and in 1903 raised to the Peerage, the title of Baron Burnham being taken from the Hundred of Burnham in Buckinghamshire, where is situated the greater part of his well-known Hall Barn estate. He always took a keen interest in journalism and journalists and became a Vice-President of the Newspaper Press Fund in 1867, and a trustee from 1880 to 1890. In 1908, on the death of Lord Glenesk, he became President, a position which he held until his death. He was also President of the Institute of Journalists in 1892, and ten years later he became hon. treasurer of the Institute Orphan Fund. Lord Burnham married in 1862 Harriet Georgiana, only daughter of Benjamin Nottingham Webster and was left a widower in 1897. He leaves two sons and a daughter.

— **Miss Ada Rehan**, the great Shakespearian actress, was born at Limerick in 1860; she went to the United States as a child and made her first appearance on the stage in 1874 at New Jersey. Her first appearance in London was at Toole's Theatre in 1884. She also acted at the Strand Theatre in 1886, at the Gaiety in 1888, at the Lyceum in 1890, and at Daly's in 1898 and 1895. She joined Mr. Augustin Daly's company in 1879 and her connexion with the company lasted till Daly's death twenty years later. She retired from the stage in 1906.

10. **Dr. Guido Baccelli**, the famous physician, was born in 1833. In 1856 he was appointed Substitute Professor of Forensic Medicine in the University of Rome, and in 1863 he succeeded to the Chair of Chemical Medicine, which

he held to the day of his death. Dr. Baccelli had a world-wide professional reputation, and he also played a considerable part in Italian politics.

10. **General Huerta**, the Mexican Dictator, was born in 1854, in a small town named Colotlán, in the State of Jalisco. When a young boy he was taken to President Benito Juárez in Mexico City, who ordered him to be placed in the Military College. He remained there seven years. From 1878 to 1912 Huerta was on active scientific and military service in different parts of the country, advancing to the rank of General in 1901. His military career was a series of successes, ending in the suppression of the Chihuahua rebellion in 1912 under the Madero regime. In February, 1913, he was in Mexico City as Military Commander of the Federal District, and in that capacity arrested President Madero and his Cabinet. It was through the murders of Madero and his Vice-President that Huerta had to face the resolute hostility of Washington, who laid the guilt at his door. He was, however, confirmed as Interim-President in the new elections which the United States insisted on being held. It was not until July 15, 1914, that Huerta retired from his dictatorship. He was a man of great courage, an excellent speaker and a born leader.

13. **Count Lützow**, D.Litt. Oxon., Ph.D. of the Czech University of Prague, died in Switzerland. In 1904 he was appointed Ilchester Lecturer at Oxford on Slavonic subjects. He was a member of the Austrian Parliament from 1885 to 1889, and had been Chamberlain of the Emperor of Austria since 1881.

— **Sir William Onslow** was the eldest son of Sir Matthew Richard Onslow, and was born at Simla in 1845. He was educated at Marlborough and joined the 12th Regiment in 1864; and in 1875 he became a Captain in the 3rd (Militia) Battalion of the Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry. He succeeded his father as fifth baronet in 1876, and he married in 1873 the youngest daughter of Sir Arthur Knox-Gore, by whom he had four sons and four daughters.

— **Dr. Reginald Koettlitz**, who acted as the senior doctor with Captain Scott's Antarctic Expedition on board the *Discovery*, died, with his wife, from dysentery in East South Africa.

Dr. Koettlitz, who was educated at Dover College and afterwards passed through Guy's, was the son of a minister of the Reformed Lutheran Church.

14. **Lady Biddulph**, born in 1834, was the eldest daughter of the fourth Earl of Hardwicke and married Lord Biddulph in 1877 as his second wife. Her knowledge of foreign languages, especially of French, made foreign travel agreeable to her. She was in Paris at the outbreak of the Franco-German war and left by one of the last trains before the siege. On her return she saw much of the exiled Emperor and the Empress Eugénie at Chislehurst. About this time she was appointed a Woman of the Bedchamber by Queen Victoria, and she was present at all the ceremonies which marked the closing years of the Queen's reign.

17. **Sir Francis Ley, Bart.**, the only son of Mr. George Phillips Ley, was born in 1846. Sir Francis was Lord of the manors of Epperstone, Notts., and of Lazonby, Stafford, Glassonby and Kirkoswald, Cumberland, and owned about 6,500 acres of agricultural property. In 1874 he founded Ley's works in Derby. He was created a Baronet in 1905.

— **The Right Hon. Sir Andrew Richard Scoble, K.C.S.I., K.C.**, was born in London, educated at the City of London School, and called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn. He went out to Bombay and built up a large practice there and in 1863 became Clerk of the Crown in the High Court. He came back to London in 1875, but returned to India at the end of 1886 as Legal Member of the Governor-General's Council. He received the K.C.S.I. in 1890. In 1892 he came home in time for the general election and was returned for Central Hackney as a Unionist and held the seat until 1900, when he did not seek re-election. In 1899 Sir Andrew was appointed Treasurer of Lincoln's Inn.

20. **Brigadier-General Hugh Gregory Fitton, C.B., D.S.O., A.D.C.**, died of wounds in France. He was born in 1863 and entered the Army in 1884, obtaining his first appointment in the Royal Berkshire Regiment. In 1905 he obtained his colonelcy in the Royal West Kent Regiment. From 1894 to 1899 he was attached to the Egyptian Army and saw much active service. Brigadier-General Fitton also served in the

South African war. He had been A.D.C. to the King since 1907.

23. **Sir John Leslie**, the son of Colonel Charles Powell Leslie, M.P., was born in 1822. He succeeded to the Glaslough estates on the death of his brother Charles in 1871, and represented North Monaghan in the House of Commons from that date until 1880. In 1876 he was made a Baronet. He was an admirable artist and a great critic and numbered amongst his friends all the great artists of his day. Sir John married in 1856, Lady Constance Dawson Damer, granddaughter of the first Earl of Portarlington.

— **Kunwar Sir Ranbir Singh, K.C.S.I.**, uncle of the Maharaja of Patiala, died recently at the age of 42. He had served on both the Punjab and the Imperial Legislatures.

24. **M. George Theotokis**, Greek Minister of National Economy and Public Instruction, died in Athens. He began his public career as Deputy for Corfu. From 1886 to 1890 he held office as Minister of Marine as a Triompist. During the next few years he repeatedly acted as Minister of the Interior. For various periods he held the Premiership and he was the first Ionian Prime Minister. He was at the head of the Government in 1909 when the grave constitutional crisis occurred which shook Greece to her foundations. M. Theotokis retired, and his blame in the circumstances was not considered great. His name will rank amongst the foremost Greek politicians of the last generation.

25. **The Very Rev. Francis Pigou, Dean of Bristol**, was born at Baden-Baden in 1832. He went to several schools and finally in 1854 he graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, receiving also the testimonium in Divinity. In 1869 he was appointed Vicar of Doncaster and six years later he was nominated by Mr. Disraeli to the Vicarage of Halifax. In 1888 he succeeded Dr. Burgon as the Dean of Winchester, but in 1891 Lord Salisbury transferred him to the deanery of Bristol. In 1899 he published a volume of reminiscences entitled "Phases of my Life," which went through several editions, and later he wrote "Odds and Ends." The late Dean was twice married.

26. **A. L. Horner, K.C., M.P.**, was born in 1864. He was educated at Queen's University, Belfast, called

to the Bar by King's Inns, Dublin, in 1887, took silk in 1904 and became a Benchers in 1912. In 1910 he was elected as a Unionist for the South Tyrone Division.

26. Frank Pownall, born in 1848, was educated at Westminster School and Exeter College, Oxford, and called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn in 1873. He took the keenest interest in music and was appointed Registrar of the Royal College of Music in 1896. He held this post until 1913, when he was compelled to resign owing to ill-health.

— **Lady Ulrica Thynne**, the second daughter of the twelfth Duke of Somerset, was born in 1833. She married in 1858 Lord Henry Frederick Thynne, second son of the third Marquess of Bath. There were four sons and two daughters of the marriage.

— **Right Hon. Richard James Meredith**, formerly Master of the Rolls in Ireland, was born in 1856 and educated at Trinity College, Dublin. He was called to the Irish Bar in 1879, taking silk thirteen years later. In 1896 he became a member of the Irish Privy Council and two years later he was appointed a Judge of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland and Judicial Commissioner of the Irish Land Commission. In 1906 he was appointed Master of the Rolls. He retired in 1912 owing to ill-health.

28. Sir Francis Henry Lovell, Dean of the London School of Tropical Medicine, was born in 1844. He began his life-work as Colonial Surgeon of Sierra Leone, 1873-78. From Sierra Leone he went to become Chief Medical Officer of Mauritius and Member of the Legislative Council, 1878-93; later he was appointed Surgeon-General of Trinidad and Tobago and Member of the Executive and Legislative Councils, 1893-1901. He retired from Colonial Service in this latter year and in 1903 was appointed Dean of the London School of Tropical Medicine. Sir Francis was created C.M.G. in 1893 and knighted in 1900. He was a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons.

— **Colonel Sir Clement Royds, C.B.**, was born in 1842. He sat for Rochdale as a Unionist from 1895 to 1906. He was at one time Colonel commanding the Duke of Lancaster's Own Yeomanry.

28. Gerard Gustavus Ducarel, Marquis de la Pasture, was born in 1838 and succeeded to the marquise in 1840 on the death of his father. The late marquis was twice married.

— **Colonel R. H. Vetch, C.B.**, the eldest surviving son of Captain James Vetch, R.E., F.R.S., Conservator of Harbours at the Admiralty, was born in 1841. He was gazetted to the Royal Engineers in 1857. He was for a time Deputy-Inspector-General of Fortifications and afterwards Chief Engineer in Ireland, retiring in 1898 with a distinguished service pension. He will be chiefly remembered as a military historian and biographer. He also contributed many military articles to the "Encyclopædia Britannica" and the "Dictionary of National Biography."

— **The Rev. Richard Carr Kirkpatrick** was the youngest son of the late William Kirkpatrick of Donacomper, Co. Kildare, born in 1823. He was a scholar of Trinity College, Dublin, he graduated in 1846 and took the Divinity Testimonium in the following year. He was ordained by the Bishop of Lincoln in 1848. In 1866 he was appointed Curate-in-charge at St. Mary's Kilburn and on the death of the Vicar he started St. Augustine's Mission in the neighbourhood, and thus entered on a work that was to engage him for the rest of his active ministry. The church, St. Augustine's, which he had built is one of the most dignified places of worship in London. He resigned his benefice in the summer of 1907.

29. Brigadier-General Sir Rollo Estonteville Grimston died at the age of 55 and had served thirty-five years in the Indian Army. From 1893 to 1898 he was A.D.C. to the Viceroy of India. He was appointed Equerry-in-Waiting to the King in 1910, and was Military Secretary to His Majesty during the Indian tour of the King and Queen. Sir Rollo was created C.I.E. in 1906 and K.C.V.O. in 1911.

30. Sir Clements Markham, the son of the Rev. David F. Markham, Vicar of Stillingfleet and Canon of Windsor, was born in 1830. He was educated at Cheam and at Westminster School. The Markhams had been for generations more or less of a naval family and young Markham entered the Service in 1844, attained the rank of Lieutenant in 1851 and retired from

the Navy in 1852. He went with the Franklin Search Expedition of 1850-51 and this created in him a great interest in Polar exploration. In 1852 he published the story of his experiences under the title of "Franklin's Footsteps." In 1859 he was entrusted with the superintendence of the necessary arrangements for the collection of cinchona plants and for their introduction into India. In 1860 he again visited South America and arranged with complete success the transmission of the invaluable plant into India which was the means of reducing the price of quinine from many shillings to a few pence per ounce. In 1854 Clements Markham joined the Royal Geographical Society and was elected honorary secretary in 1863, a position which he held till 1888 when he was awarded the Founder's medal. In 1867 he was appointed to the charge of the Geographical Department of the India Office, a position which he retained

till 1877. Sir Clements Markham will be remembered by his long official connexion with the Royal Geographical Society. The enterprise with which he was most intimately associated was the National Antarctic Expedition, and owing to his choice of commander—Captain R. F. Scott—it was one of the most successful expeditions that ever left our shores. Sir Clements Markham was a Fellow of the Royal Society since 1873. He was created C.B. in 1871 and K.C.B. in 1896. He published numerous works.

Lord Forbes, premier baron in the peerage of Scotland and chief of the clan Forbes, was the sixth son of the nineteenth baron, born in 1841. All his elder brothers died unmarried and he succeeded his second brother as twenty-first baron in June, 1914. He married in 1876 the youngest daughter of Sir William Dick-Cunyngham, by whom he had two sons and a daughter.

FEBRUARY.

1. **Prince Yussuf Izz-ed-Din**, the Turkish heir-apparent, committed suicide owing to illness. He was born at Constantinople on October 9, 1857. He was the eldest son of Abdul Aziz, who was Sultan from 1861 to 1876. From his father he inherited a taste for travel, in which he freely indulged. In 1910 he represented the Sultan at the funeral of King Edward VII. Throughout the reign of Abdul Hamid, Yussuf Izz-ed-Din effaced himself, but he was supposed to have great sympathy with the Constitutional movement.

2. **Count Illarion Ivanovitch Vorontzoff-Dashkoff**, the famous Viceroy of the Caucasus, was born in 1837. He was heir to an immense fortune and entered the Army as a youth and rose by military merit to the Colonelcy of the Imperial Hussar Regiment at the age of 26. It was in 1905 that he was sent by the Emperor Nicholas as Viceroy of the Caucasus, and by his strong and firm rule the Armenians became the most loyal subjects of the Emperor.

3. **Professor Joseph Jacobs** was born at Sydney, New South Wales, in 1854, and after taking his degree at Cambridge he went to Berlin in 1877, where he studied under Steinschneider and Lazarus. He was Secretary of the Society of Hebrew Literature from 1878-84. He was a critic, folk-lorist,

historian and communal worker and became a great friend of George Eliot's.

4. **Admiral John Frederick George Grant** entered the Navy in 1848 and was midshipman and mate of the *Highflyer* in the Crimea. He was awarded the Crimean and Turkish medals and the Sevastopol clasp. In 1860 Admiral Grant was present at the capture of the Taku Forts and received the Chinese medal. From 1879 to 1881 he commanded the troopship *Malabar* and was Captain Superintendent of Bermuda Dockyard from 1884-87. From 1876 he had been employed by the Home Department as a nautical Assessor in shipping inquiries.

6. **Canon George John Blore, D.D.**, the son of Edward Blore, F.R.S., was born in 1836. He was educated at Charterhouse and Christ Church, of which he was senior student and tutor. In 1868 he became headmaster of King Edward's School, Bromsgrove, and in 1873 of King's School, Canterbury. He retired in 1886 and was appointed Hon. Canon of Canterbury.

— **Sir Cecil Clementi-Smith, G.C.M.G.**, was born in 1840. His mother was the daughter of Muzio Clementi, the composer. He was educated at St. Paul's School and at

Corpus, Cambridge. In 1862 he was elected one of the first student-interpreters at Hong-Kong, where he became Colonial Treasurer. He was transferred to the Straits Settlements as Colonial Secretary in 1878. Subsequently he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Ceylon and in 1887 Governor of the Straits Settlements. He became High Commissioner and Consul-General for Borneo and Sarawak in 1889 and retired four years later. Sir Cecil was President of the Commission of Inquiry on the Trinidad Riots in 1903 and served on the Tariff Commission of 1904. He was the Chief British delegate to the International Opium Commission at Shanghai in 1909 and to the Conference on the same subject at the Hague two years later, and on both occasions was thanked by the Government for his services.

6. Dowager Countess Kintore, the daughter of Mr. Francis Hawkins, was born in 1835. She married in 1851 the eighth Earl of Kintore, her first cousin, who died in 1880. There were four sons and three daughters of the marriage; the eldest son is the present holder of the title.

7. Earl of Kinnoull, the third son of the eleventh Earl, was born in 1855. The eldest and second sons predeceased their father and the late Earl succeeded to the title in 1897. Lord Kinnoull joined the 1st Black Watch and served in Egypt as Chief of Staff to Baker Pasha. He retired from the Army in 1886. He was a musician of considerable talent and a collector on a large scale. His first marriage took place in 1877 and there was one son of the marriage who died in 1903 leaving a son born in 1902, who succeeds to the title.

9. Brigadier-General Charles Henry Westmorland, C.B., was born in 1856, entered the Army in 1874, retiring in 1912 with the honorary rank of Brigadier-General. From 1907 to 1910 he was in command of the Karachi Brigade. He saw active service in the Afghan War, 1878-79, the Burmese Expedition, 1887-89, on the North-West Frontier of India in 1897-98, and in China, 1900. He was made a C.B. in 1908.

— **Sir Charles Rivers Wilson** was born in 1831 and educated at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford. He took the degree of B.A. in 1863 in the School of Law and Modern History, long since

abolished, and three years later, in February, 1866, entered the Treasury. He passed through the usual preliminary stages of an able Treasury official and in 1874 he was appointed Comptroller-General of the National Debt, the principal permanent official of the National Debt office, a position which he held until 1894. In the earlier years in which he held this office he did distinguished service in Egyptian Finance and served as Finance Minister of Egypt from 1877 to 1880. In recognition of his services Mr. Wilson was made a K.C.M.G. in 1880. In 1894 Sir Charles Rivers Wilson retired from the National Debt Office. In the following year he became President of the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. He was a member of St. James's and Marlborough Clubs and also of Arthur's.

10. Hon. Robert Henry Douglas-Scott-Montagu was the second son of the first Lord Montagu of Beaulieu and was born in 1867. He married in 1904 the widow of Mr. Oscar Davy-Davies. He was heir presumptive to his brother, the present Lord Montagu. There is no second heir.

— **Sir Hugh Wyndham, C.B., K.C.M.G.**, the eldest son of Colonel Charles Wyndham, was born in 1836. His mother was a daughter of the sixth Baron Polwarth. He was educated at Harrow and Oxford and entered the diplomatic service in 1857. In 1859 he accompanied the China expeditionary force and resided for two years in Peking. After acting as Consul-General at Warsaw he was Secretary of Legation successively at Athens, Madrid, Petrograd, and Constantinople. In 1885 he went as Minister in Brazil, and for the last three years of his active career in Rumania, retiring on a pension in 1897. He received his C.B. for services at Athens during the Russo-Turkish war, and the K.C.M.G. for services at Rio de Janeiro during the insurgent movement there in 1893-94.

13. Vilhelm Hammershøj, the Danish painter, died in his 52nd year. Some of his pictures were shown at the Guildhall in the summer of 1907 and attracted a good deal of attention. At the Jubilee Exhibition at Turin, Mr. Hammershøj was among the ten painters selected for the special award of 10,000 f.

— **Viscount Weymouth**, the elder son and heir of the Marquess of Bath, was born in 1895. He was

gazetted Second Lieutenant in the 5th Reserve Regiment of Cavalry in December, 1914, and was serving with the 2nd Dragoons (Royal Scots Greys) when he was killed in France. He was educated at Winchester.

14. Viscount Ridley was the eldest son of the first Viscount by his marriage with the Hon. Mary Georgiana Marjoribanks, eldest daughter of the first Lord Tweedmouth. He was born in 1874 and educated at Eton and Balliol. When he left Oxford he acted as private secretary to his father at the Home Office and subsequently he travelled through Canada as extra aide-de-camp to Lord Aberdeen. He was elected to the House of Commons for Stalybridge in 1900 and became private secretary to Mr. Ritchie at the Home Office and afterwards assistant private secretary to Mr. Austen Chamberlain as Chancellor of the Exchequer. In 1904 he succeeded his father as second Viscount Ridley and Baron Wensleydale. In 1899 he married the Hon. Rosamund Cornelia Gwladys Guest, daughter of the first Baron Wimborne. His son, the Hon. Matthew White Ridley, born in 1902, succeeds to the title. The late Lord Ridley was chairman of the Tariff Reform League and his enthusiasm in the cause of Tariff Reform was well known.

— **General Walter Coningham, C.B.**, born in 1839, was a son of General Henry Coningham. He saw service in the Indian Mutiny and on the Staff in Afghanistan in 1879, being mentioned in dispatches and receiving his brevet of Lieutenant-Colonel and the C.B. He retired in 1887.

— **Sir George Pragnell**, who was managing partner of Messrs. Cook, Son & Co., St. Paul's Churchyard, and chairman of the Wholesale Textile Association, was born at Sherborne in 1868. After being apprenticed to a draper at Exeter, he came to London in 1881 and joined the firm as assistant, till in 1907 he became its managing partner. Sir George's patriotic and philanthropic activities were manifold. He was chairman of the National Patriotic Association and of the Employers Territorial Association. He was a firm supporter of the value of athletics and founded the City of London Swimming and Athletic Association. He was also a founder of the Royal Life-Saving Society and the London Water Polo League. His knighthood was one of the birthday honours of 1912.

14. Lewanika, King of Barotseland, was about 64 years of age. He came of a long line of Barotseland rulers and succeeded to the throne in 1877. He was Paramount Chief of the Barotse tribe. In 1890 his kingdom came practically, and in 1897 definitely, under British protection, the King receiving an annual subsidy from the Chartered Company. In 1902 King Lewanika visited England as a Royal guest for the Coronation, and he spent his time largely in studying agriculture and machinery. The King possessed great confidence in the British Government and expressed his loyalty on many occasions.

15. Sir William Turner, born in 1882, was educated at St. Bartholomew's Hospital and graduated M.B. of London. Later he received the F.R.C.S. One of his teachers was Sir James Paget. In 1854 he became senior demonstrator in Anatomy at Edinburgh University. Thirteen years later he succeeded to the Professor's chair; and finally he became Principal and Vice-Chancellor of Edinburgh University. He was also President of the Royal College of Surgeons, Secretary of the Edinburgh Royal Society, President of the British Association in 1900, and President of the General Medical Council from 1898 to 1904. He published several works. Turner made a speciality of the brain, and was a great authority on craniology, having one of the finest collections of human skulls in the world. He was knighted in 1886 and made K.C.B. in 1901.

16. Sir Alfred Thomas Bagge, the second son of the first baronet, was born in 1848. He entered the Navy in 1857, and served through the China War, including the capture of the Taku Forts. He retired from the Navy with the rank of Captain in 1893. Sir Alfred married in 1872 a daughter of the late Mr. John Grant Morris and leaves three sons and a daughter.

— **Viscountess Iveagh** was the daughter of the late Mr. Richard Samuel Guinness, M.P., by his marriage with the daughter of Sir Charles Jenkinson, tenth baronet of Hawkesbury. She married her cousin, Mr. Edward Cecil Guinness, in 1878; he was created a Baronet in 1886, a Baron in 1891, and a Viscount in 1905. There are three sons of the marriage.

18. **Herbert Paul Richards** was born in 1848. Educated at the Old Kensington Grammar School, he won a Balliol Scholarship before he was 18, and afterwards the Jenkyns exhibition and a proxime for the Hertford. He was also librarian of the Union, where he had been a frequent speaker. Immediately on taking his degree, in 1870, he was elected to a Fellowship at Wadham, and there he spent the remainder of his life. He was a Greek scholar of marked ability, and possibly there was no contemporary in England who possessed such a familiar acquaintance with the entire domain of Greek literature.

19. **Colonel Augustus Le Mesurier, C.I.E., R.E.**, who served during the Indian Mutiny, was born in 1839. He entered the Army in 1856, retiring in 1893. During the Mutiny he was present at the sieges of Forts Beyt and Dwarka. He also saw active service with the Abyssinian Expedition, 1867-68, and in the Afghan War, 1878-79, being mentioned in dispatches on both occasions, and in the Hazara Campaign, 1891.

— **His Highness Sir Idris Mersid-el-Aazam, G. C. M. G., G.C.V.O.**, Sultan of Perak, died recently. He was one of the best known of the ruling chiefs of the Federated Malay States.

21. **Colonel Charles Hunter**, the eldest son of Lieutenant-Colonel Charles Hunter, was born in 1833. He entered the Army in 1852, and served during the Mutiny. He was present at the siege of Dehli and the siege and capture of Lucknow. He was mentioned twice in dispatches and awarded the medal with three clasps.

— **Sir Edward Holroyd** was born in 1838. He was educated at Winchester and Trinity College, Cambridge, and there he obtained a first class in the classical tripos. He was called to the Bar by Gray's Inn in 1855, and four years afterwards he became a member of the Melbourne Bar. In 1881 he accepted promotion to the Bench, and he held the position of a Justice of the Supreme Court of Victoria for twenty-five years.

— **Rear-Admiral von Pohl**, the former chief of the German Navy, died recently. He was 60 years of age.

23. **Sir George Martin**, organist of St. Paul's Cathedral, was born in 1844, and early became a pupil and friend of Stainer who was only four years his senior. In 1876 he became deputy organist of St. Paul's Cathedral and in 1883 the degree of Doctor of Music was conferred upon him by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1888 Stainer resigned his position as organist of St. Paul's and Martin was appointed his successor. His skill as a trainer of boys' voices was great, and the singing of St. Paul's has become celebrated all the world over. His activities had been confined almost entirely to Church music and almost all his work was done at the Cathedral. He wrote the "Te Deum" for the thanksgiving service held on the occasion of Queen Victoria's Jubilee, and soon after this occasion he received the honour of knighthood.

— **John Payne** was descended, in the female line, from Admiral Sir John Hawkins. He was born in 1842 and his tastes were entirely literary and linguistic. He translated many notable works, amongst them being the whole of Dante's poetical works; but his masterpiece in this field was his rendering of the "Arabian Nights" in nine volumes.

24. **Jabez Spencer Balfour**, born in 1843, was educated abroad and spent some years in business in London before starting the Lands Allotment Company, the oldest of the Liberator group in 1867. He was the principal promoter of the Liberator group of companies, which purported to be a building society, but contrary to the rules of such societies engaged in speculative business. The affairs of the various companies were so interwoven with each other that when one collapsed the rest were bound to follow, and all of them failed in 1892. The total liabilities were 8,360,000*l.* Balfour fled to Buenos Aires to avoid arrest, but was sent back to England in 1895 and sentenced to fourteen years' penal servitude for conspiracy and fraud. He was released in 1906. In spite of his financial activities Balfour found time to represent Tamworth (1880-85) and Burnley (1889-93) as a Liberal in Parliament, and in 1883 he was chosen the first Mayor of Croydon, where he then lived.

25. **Sir George Laurence Gomme**, born in 1853, was educated at the City of London School. At an early age he entered the service of the Met-

ropolitan Board of Works. In 1891 he was appointed Statistical Officer to the London County Council and in 1900 he succeeded Mr. C. J. Stewart as Clerk to the Council. He held the post until 1914. Few men have had a more profound knowledge of the past and present greatness of London. He was founder of the Folklore Society and at one time edited *The Antiquary*, *The Archaeological Review* and *The Folklore Journal*. He published many works on folklore and antiquarian subjects. Mr. Gomme was knighted in 1911.

27. Lister Maurice Drummond, the Metropolitan Police Magistrate, was the son of Maurice Drummond, C.B., by his wife the Hon. Adelaide (*née* Lister), eldest daughter of the second Lord Ribblesdale. Mr. Drummond was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple in 1879. He was appointed Metropolitan Police Magistrate in 1913.

— **Count Ugo Balzani**, the great mediæval historian, died in Rome. He was 68 years old. Balzani was elected a member of the Athenæum Club in 1895, and in 1902 received the honorary degree of D.Litt. at Oxford. He was a contributor to the eleventh edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica."

28. Henry James, O.M., born in 1843 in New York, was the son of Henry James, senior, a well-known writer and lecturer on theological subjects. The distinguished philosopher William James was the novelist's elder brother. The family spent a long period in Europe during the fifties and the boys received a somewhat unusual education chiefly in

Paris and London. At nineteen Henry entered the Harvard Law School, but literature drew him irresistibly and he finally forsook the law and in 1869 adopted literature as his profession. In that year he came to Europe and spent much time in Italy and France. From 1880 he made his home in England, at first in London, later on in Rye, Sussex. In 1918, on the occasion of his 70th birthday, a great number of his friends invited him to sit to Mr. Sargent for his portrait. This portrait is to be offered to the nation. In July, 1915, he became naturalised as an English subject. The distinction of the Order of Merit was conferred on him on New Year's Day, 1916. His best known works were "The Tragic Muse" (1890); "What Maisie knew" (1897); "The Ambassadors" (1908); "A Small Boy and Others" (1913), and "Notes of a Son and Brother" (1914). None of his works obtained for him anything in the nature of a "popular" success; his writing was of a delicate and refined nature that could only appeal to the few.

28. The Rev. Hudson Grosett Heaven, who was long known as the King of Lundy Island, of which he was lord of the manor and sole landowner, was born in Torrington, Devon, in 1826. Mr. Heaven's father, who was the head of an old Somerset family, bought the island in 1834 and lived there with his family. The Rev. Hudson Heaven graduated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1851 and was ordained in the following year. In 1864 he returned to Lundy as Curate; in 1886 he became Vicar until 1911. After his father's death in 1887 until five years before his death he administered the affairs of the community.

MARCH.

1. General Edward Henry Clive was the eldest son of George Olive, who was M.P. for Hereford and for a short time Under-Secretary for the Home Department. He was educated at Harrow and joined the Grenadier Guards with whom he served in the Crimea from the fall of Sevastopol till the end of the war. In 1880 he succeeded to the command of his regiment and held the command of the Guards Brigade when it was in Cyprus a few years later. On his return to England he became Commandant of the Staff College and was afterwards Governor of the Royal Military College from 1888 to 1893.

1. Lord Derwent, the elder son of Sir John Johnstone, second baronet, by his marriage with a daughter of Edward Harcourt, Archbishop of York, was born in 1829. He was educated at Eton and at one time held a commission in the 2nd Life Guards. From 1869 until 1880 he sat in the House of Commons as a Liberal and became a Unionist at the split on Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill. He was created a Baron in 1881. Lord Derwent married in 1850 the second daughter of Sir Charles Mills, sister of the first Lord Hillingdon, and leaves five sons and a daughter.

1. **M. Mounet-Sully**, the great French tragedian, was born at Bergerac in 1841. He entered the Conservatoire at the age of 21 and was awarded the first prize for tragedy. He was an officer of the Legion of Honour.

2. **Queen Elizabeth of Rumania** (Carmen Sylva) was born at Neuwied on December 29, 1843, the daughter of Prince Hermann of Wied and his consort, a sister of Grand Duke Adolf of Luxemburg. She inherited her literary talent from her father. In 1869 she married Prince Charles and was crowned Queen of Rumania on May 22, 1881. She did not seem to interest herself in Rumanian politics, but devoted herself to becoming a good Rumanian and encouraged native arts and industries. She learnt the language too, well enough to write poetry in it. The chief interest in her life was literature. She published under the pseudonym of "Carmen Sylva" twenty volumes of verse—nineteen in German and one in English. Her works were translated into the languages of almost the whole of Europe. She also wrote many novelettes and dramas and contributed to *La Revue* and *Les Annales Politiques et Littéraires* on the place of Woman in Modern Sport, the True Nobility of Woman, and the position of Woman in Rumania.

3. **Professor John Wesley Judd, C.B., LL.D., F.R.S., F.G.S.**, was born in 1840 and educated at the Royal School of Mines. He was Professor of Geology from 1876 to 1905 and Dean of the Royal College of Science, London, for the last ten years of that period. He was author of "The Students' Lyell," "The Coming Evolution," and other scientific publications.

4. **William Angus Knight**, the son of a minister of the Scottish Church, was born in 1836. In 1876 he was appointed to the Chair of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrews University. He was instrumental in inaugurating the L.L.A. (Licentiate in Literature and Arts) degree for women; but he was best known for his services to the memory of Wordsworth.

— **Viscountess Quenington** was the daughter of Mr. H. D. Brocklehurst, of Sudley Castle, Gloucestershire, and married in 1909 Viscount Quenington, better known as Mr. Michael Hicks Beach, M.P., son and heir of Earl St. Aldwyn.

5. **Colonel John Mount Batten, C.B.**, was born in 1843. He had been from 1905 until recently Lord Lieutenant of the counties of Dorset and Poole. He served for forty-two years in The King's and commanded the third battalion in the Boer War.

— **Captain Lord Desmond Fitzgerald** died recently in France. He was the second son of Gerald, fifth Duke of Leinster, born in 1888. He was brother to the Duke of Leinster and heir-presumptive to the dukedom. He obtained his first appointment in the Irish Guards in 1909 and was promoted Captain in 1913. He was twice wounded, in September, 1914, and in October, 1915, and was mentioned in dispatches, being awarded the Military Cross in June, 1915.

8. **Captain Ralph MacGeough-Bond-Shelton** was educated at Cheltenham. In 1852 he was a Cornet in the 12th Lancers when the troopship *Birkenhead* was taking out drafts for the Kaffir War. He is believed to be the last survivor of the wreck of the *Birkenhead*. Bond afterwards served in the Crimea and in the Indian Mutiny. He took the name of Shelton when he succeeded to his father's property.

9. **Lord Ronald Sutherland Gower**, a younger son of the second Duke and twentieth Earl of Sutherland and of his wife Harriet, daughter of the sixth Earl of Carlisle, was born at Stafford House in 1845. He was educated at Eton and Trinity, Cambridge. He sat in the House of Commons as a Liberal member for Sutherlandshire from 1867 until 1874; but he had no taste for the work. His real interests were centred in art and travel. He wrote on many subjects, but his "Reminiscences" (1883) and "Old Diaries" (1902) had the greatest success.

— **Judge Lionel Sandars** was born in 1859 and called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1880. He was elected to the Presidency of the Mixed Court of Appeal of Egypt, eighteen months ago, and was the first Englishman to hold the position since its creation.

11. **Lady Baker**, widow of the explorer Sir Samuel White Baker, was the daughter of Herr Finian von Sass, a Hungarian, and married Sir Samuel as his second wife in 1860, accompanying him through all his subsequent

travels. She had many hardships to endure, but her pluck and presence of mind never failed her. Her husband in one of his narratives writes, "she was always a thoughtful and wise counsellor, and much of my success, during long nine years passed in Africa, is due to my devoted companion." Sir Samuel died in 1893.

11. The Dowager Lady Erroll, born in 1828, was the eldest daughter of the Hon. Sir Charles Gore, and granddaughter of the second Earl of Arran, and married, in 1848, the eighteenth Earl of Erroll who died in 1891. Lady Erroll was a Lady-in-Waiting to Queen Victoria, and a member of the Order of Victoria and Albert.

— **Captain George Crosfield Norris Nicholson**, of the Royal Flying Corps, was killed while flying in England after several months' service at the front. He was the only son of Sir Charles Nicholson, Bt., born in 1884, and educated at Eton and Clare College, Cambridge. In 1908 he went to the War Office as private secretary to Colonel Seely, then Under-Secretary for War. He became principal private secretary to Colonel Seely, on his appointment as Secretary for War in 1912. Captain Nicholson took up flying at the beginning of the European War and rapidly became a proficient pilot. He married in 1906 the Hon. Evelyn Murray, youngest daughter of Viscount Elibank, and his son, born in 1911, becomes heir to the baronetcy.

12. Lord Thurlow was born in 1833, the second son of the third baron, and entered the Diplomatic Service at the age of 20. He held posts at Stockholm, Paris, Vienna, Washington and the Hague. He acted as private secretary to Lord Elgin during his Viceroyalty of India. In 1864 he married Lord Elgin's only daughter, by whom he had four sons and two daughters. He succeeded to the peerage in 1874, when his elder brother died unmarried.

— **Captain the Hon. Robert Stafford Arthur Palmer** died in a Turkish camp of wounds received in action on the Tigris on January 21. He was the second son of Lord Selborne, born in 1889. He was a barrister-at-law of the Inner Temple.

— **Colonel Sir Charles Moore Watson, K.C.M.G., C.B., R.E.**, born in Dublin in 1844, was the son of William Watson, a well-known civil

engineer. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he entered Woolwich first in the list in 1863, passing out in 1865 still at the top. In 1866 he was commissioned Lieutenant in the Royal Engineers. In 1874 General Gordon invited him to join him in the Sudan for survey work; but after surveying the White Nile to Gondokoro he was invalided home in May, 1875. The friendship with General Gordon was cemented for life. Captain Watson will always be remembered as the daring captor of the Citadel of Cairo after the Battle of Tel-el-Kebir. In 1902 he retired from the Army under the age clause, and was made a C.B.

15. Lady Marshall, widow of Lieutenant-General Sir Frederick Marshall, K.C.M.G., was the daughter of Captain Edward Giles Howard, nephew of the twelfth Duke of Norfolk. She was married in 1861 to Sir Frederick Marshall, who died in 1900.

16. Lady Kelvin was the daughter of Mr. Charles R. Blandy of Madeira, and married Lord Kelvin, then Sir William Thomson, as his second wife in 1874. He received a barony in 1892, but died in 1907 without issue and the peerage became extinct.

17. Sir Charles Ball, born in 1851, was the youngest son of Dr. Robert Ball of Dublin, President of the Geological Society of Ireland. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he won several distinctions; he was Honorary Surgeon to the King in Ireland, Regius Professor of Surgery at Dublin University, a member of the General Medical Council, and formerly a Commissioner for Education in Ireland, and a member of the Advisory Board for Army Medical Service. He received a knighthood in 1903, and a baronetcy in 1911. Sir Charles married a daughter of the late Mr. Daniel Kinahan of Roebuck Park, Dublin, and leaves three sons and four daughters.

— **Mrs. Frankau (Frank Danby)**, the novelist, came of a very clever family, being a sister of Mrs. Aria and of the late James Davis (Ower Hall). She was born in 1864, and married a wealthy merchant at the age of 19. She began to write very early in life and by the time she was 23 she had already published a very successful novel. A few years later she devoted herself to the study of old engravings, and she published three huge volumes on the subject. She then again began novel writing and began a series of

stories under the pseudonym of "Frank Danby" which won wide popularity.

17. Viscountess Gage was the second daughter of the Rev. Frederick Peel (a grandson of Sir Robert Peel, first baronet) by his marriage with a sister of Lord Sudeley. She married in 1894 the fifth Viscount Gage, who died in 1912, and by whom she had one son and three daughters.

18. Rev. Stopford Brooke was born in 1832, a member of a well-known Irish family. He went to school at Kilderminster and Kingstown, and graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he obtained the Downe prize and the Vice-Chancellor's prize for English verse. He was soon afterwards ordained, becoming curate of St. Matthew, Marylebone, in 1857. He quickly became known for the eloquence of his sermons and for his interest in literary and artistic matters. He was made Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen in 1872. In 1865 he published what has been considered his most important book, the "Life and Letters of Frederick W. Robertson." In 1880 Mr. Brooke announced that he had seceded from the Established Church of England. From this time he acted with the Unitarians. He was greatly influenced by Ruskin and was for a time one of the most ardent of that great writer's followers. He wrote and published many works on English literature, the most important being the monumental "History of Early English Literature."

— **Elizabeth Lady Lawrence** was the widow of Sir Trevor Lawrence. She recently took an active part in the fund organised by the Royal Horticultural Society for the relief of the ruined Belgian horticulturists.

— **Cardinal Gotti**, Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, was a man who showed great gifts of statesmanship. He entered the Carmelite Order in 1858; became General of the Order in 1881 and was re-elected in 1889. He was created a Cardinal in 1895.

22. The Hon. Mrs. Charles Eliot, the fourth daughter of the late Sir Josiah Guest, was born in 1845. She married in 1865 Colonel the Hon. Charles Eliot, C.V.O., fifth son of the third Earl of St. Germans, who died in 1901. Mrs. Eliot was for a time Lady-in-Waiting to Princess Frederica of Hanover.

23. The Rev. Alfred Nathaniel Holden Curzon, fourth Baron Scarsdale, was born in 1831. He was educated at Rugby and Merton College, Oxford, ordained deacon in 1854 and priest a year later. He became rector of Kedleston in 1855. In 1856 he succeeded his uncle in the title and estates, but he did not divest himself of the living; he employed a curate for the conduct of the services at Kedleston, and read the lessons himself every Sunday. Lord Scarsdale was a model landlord and he devoted the whole of his time to the interests of the people on his estate. He was a strong Conservative in politics. He married in 1856 Blanche, second daughter of Mr. Joseph Pocklington-Senhouse, of Netherall, Cumberland. He is succeeded by his eldest son, Earl Curzon of Kedleston, who was born in 1859.

28. James Leigh Strachan-Davidson, Master of Balliol, was the eldest son of Mr. James Strachan, of Ardgath, Perthshire, and Byfleet, Surrey; born in 1843 he was educated at Leamington College and went up to Balliol as Warner Exhibitioner in October, 1826. He afterwards became first secretary of the Union and later librarian and president. In 1866 he was elected a Fellow of Balliol. He lectured for a short time on philosophy, but soon turned his attention to Roman history, which became the main study of his life, and of which he was one of the leading Oxford teachers for over thirty years. He became a Lecturer of his College in 1873, Sub-Dean in the following year, and Dean and Classical Tutor in 1875. He remained Dean until he was elected Master in 1907. He was a great scholar and a generous friend. In politics he was an old-fashioned Liberal and strong Free-Trader.

— **Sir Chinubhai Madhavlal** was born in 1864. He was a great captain of industry, controlling two of the largest and most successful cotton mills in India, and took a prominent part in civic affairs. He was the first and only member of the Hindu community to be created a baronet, which honour was conferred on him in 1918.

— **General Largeau** was one of the brilliant soldiers produced by the French Colonial Infantry Corps. He died of wounds received during the battle of Verdun.

30. Rev. William Hulton Keeling, LL.D., born in 1840, the eldest son of the Rev. W. R. Keeling, was educated at Manchester Grammar School and Wadham College, Oxford. He was appointed head-master of Bradford Grammar School in 1871, which post he held for forty-four years. In 1912 he was made a freeman of the City of Bradford on the occasion of the commemoration of the 250th

anniversary of the granting of the Charter to the school.

31. Lady Drummond Wolff was the only daughter of Sholto Douglas and married in 1852 Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, former British Ambassador in Madrid, who died in 1908. She was a member of the Order of Dames Nobles de Maria Luisa.

APRIL.

3. Edward Compton Austen Leigh, great-nephew of Jane Austen and son of the Rev. J. E. Austen Leigh, was educated at Eton and King's College. He was for many years Lower Master at Eton, retiring in 1905.

4. Sir John Gorst was born in 1835. He was the second son of Mr. E. C. Lowndes, who took that name in place of Gorst on succeeding to family property. He went to St. John's College, Cambridge; was third wrangler in the Mathematical Tripos of 1857 and was elected to a Fellowship of his College. On the death of his father in 1859 he went to New Zealand and shortly after his arrival there he was appointed Inspector of Native and Missionary Schools of Waikato. Mr. Gorst afterwards returned to England and was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple in 1865 and ten years later took silk. In 1866 he was first returned to the House of Commons as member for the borough of Cambridge, but lost the seat in 1868. At the General Election of 1880 he was returned as member for Chatham. The first session of the Liberal Parliament which followed saw the rise of the famous Fourth Party, of which Mr. Gorst was a conspicuous member. It was in the Unionist Government which followed Mr. Gladstone's defeat on Home Rule in 1886 that Sir John Gorst was appointed Under-Secretary for India; this post he held until 1891. From 1891 to 1892 he was Financial Secretary to the Treasury. On the return of the Unionists to power in 1895 he was made Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education; in 1902 he retired. This was the end of his official career and he was given a political pension of 1,200*l.* a year. Then Sir John Gorst began to sever himself from the Conservative party, and after nearly half a century as a Conservative politician, he now became a Radical. In 1909—having relinquished his pension—he was

adopted as the official Liberal candidate for Preston at the General Election which was then about to take place, but the election resulted in his defeat. Sir John Gorst was twice married.

5. Field-Marshal Sir Charles Henry Brownlow, G.C.B., the only son of Colonel George Arthur Brownlow, brother of the first Lord Lurgan, was born in 1831 and entered the Indian Army as Ensign at the age of sixteen. Ten years later he raised the 8th Regiment of Punjab Infantry, which received its present designation 20th Duke of Cambridge's Own Infantry (Brownlow's Punjabis) in 1904, Sir Charles Brownlow himself being appointed to the command. Though he did not take part in the suppression of the Indian Mutiny, he had a long record of distinguished service. He was once recommended for the V.C.; the recommendation was not acted upon, but Major Brownlow was rewarded with the C.B., promotion to Lieutenant-Colonel and a clasp to his medal. He became General in 1889, and received his Field-Marshal's baton in 1908. In 1887 he was created a G.C.B.

— **Sir Gerard Augustus Lowther** was born in 1857, the second son of the Hon. William Lowther (brother of the third Earl of Lonsdale). Educated at Harrow, he entered the Diplomatic Service in 1879, and in the course of the next twenty years served at Madrid, Paris, Constantinople, Vienna, Bukarest, Sofia, Tokyo, Budapest and Washington. In 1901 he was appointed Minister to Chile and in 1905 became Minister at Tangier and Consul-General in Morocco. He received the K.C.M.G. in 1907 and in the following year was promoted to the Embassy at Constantinople, where he remained until his retirement in 1918. Sir Gerard, who had meanwhile received the G.C.M.G., was created a baronet in 1914.

5. Colonel George John Charles Whittington, C.B., the son of Mr. George Whittington, of Bath, was born in 1837. He entered the Royal North Gloucestershire Militia in 1856 and two years later joined the Royal Canadian Rifles. He saw much service and was promoted Colonel in 1892, and as Paymaster of the Rhodesian Field Force served in the South African war; he was mentioned in dispatches, awarded the Queen's medal with four clasps, and made a C.B.

6. Sir Colin Scott-Moncrieff was born in Scotland in 1836, the sixth son of Robert Scott-Moncrieff of Fossaway. He was educated at Edinburgh Academy and at Addiscombe. He went out to India in 1856 as Second Lieutenant in the Bengal Engineers, from which regiment he retired in 1883 with the rank of Colonel. By this time he had made his mark as a successful engineer. From 1883 to 1892 he worked in Egypt; a few months after his arrival there he was made Under-Secretary in the Public Works Department, Cairo, with a capable staff of military engineers under him. When he left Egypt in 1892 he had solved the problem with regard to irrigation, and his successor had a sure foundation on which to continue. For the next ten years he was Under-Secretary for Scotland, and for two years afterwards he was in India as President of the Indian Irrigation Committee. In 1887 he was made K.C.M.G. for his services in Egypt, and later he was made K.C.S.I. for his services in India.

— **Sir Alexander Simpson** was born in 1835 and received his early education at Edinburgh University. While still a student he was elected one of the presidents of the Royal Medical Society. In 1870 he was appointed to the Chair of Midwifery and Diseases of Women and Children at Edinburgh University, which he held until 1905. He was knighted in 1906.

7. Alderman Sir Thomas Boor Crosby, M.D., the son of a farmer, was born in 1830. He was educated first at a local grammar school and then at University College, London. Qualifying from St. Thomas's Hospital, he became an F.R.C.S. in 1860 and two years later took the M.D. at St. Andrews. In 1877 he began to take an interest in municipal affairs. In 1893 he was unanimously elected to the Court of Aldermen; and in 1911,

then 81 years of age, he was elected Lord Mayor of London, being the first doctor to serve in that office.

7. Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Alexander Fleetwood Pinkey, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., was born in 1861, the son of a civilian Judge in Bombay. He was commissioned to the King's Liverpool Regiment in 1882, and going out to India was in 1886 transferred to the Political Department. In 1908 Lord Minto selected him as his private secretary when Sir James Dunlop-Smith came home on leave, calling him again to office in 1910 when Sir James received another appointment. In 1911 he acted as Resident in Haidarabad.

8. Sir George Green was born in 1843. He joined the Prudential Company in 1870 and rose from the ranks. He unsuccessfully contested Glasgow as a Liberal in 1895 and Stockport in 1900 and was for seven years Chairman of the Scottish Liberal Association. He was knighted in 1911.

— **Sir Stafford Howard**, born in 1851, was the second son of the late Henry Howard, of Greystoke Castle, Cumberland. He was educated at Harrow and Trinity, Cambridge. From 1876 to 1878 he sat as a Liberal for East Cumberland, and for South Gloucestershire 1885-86; he was defeated in the latter year after being Under-Secretary for India in Mr. Gladstone's third Administration. In 1893 he became Commissioner of Woods, which post he held until his retirement in 1912.

— **Wilfred Ward**, the son of William George Ward, was born in 1856. He was educated at St. Edmund's and at Ushaw, went to the Gregorian University at Rome, and finally graduated at London University. In 1906 he became editor of the *Dublin Review*, which his father had both edited and largely written between 1860 and 1870. Wilfred Ward was a distinguished author, who will be remembered for his four biographies—"W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement," "W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival," the "Life and Times of Cardinal Newman," the "Life of Cardinal Newman," and a "Memoir of Aubrey de Vere."

11. Major-General Hugh Thomas Jones-Vaughan, C.B., was born in 1842. He served in the Indian Mutiny and was present at the capture of Lucknow. In 1887 he was appointed

A.A.G. Western District, and afterwards was General Officer Commanding in the Straits Settlements.

12. The Marquis of Clanricarde was born in 1832, the second son of the first Marquis by his marriage with Harriet, daughter of George Canning. Educated at Harrow, he entered the Diplomatic Service, but left it after ten years, during which he was stationed at Turin. In 1867 he was elected Liberal M.P. for County Galway, and sat for that division till 1871. In 1874 he succeeded his father as second marquis and fifteenth earl, his elder brother having died unmarried. Lord Clanricarde will be chiefly remembered in Ireland by his association with the agrarian problem. The Nationalist agitators found in him their sternest and most uncompromising opponent. From the moment of his succession he was hostile to the new land Act of 1870. Lord Clanricarde fought the Acts of 1886, 1903, 1907, and 1909 with the same vigour as he had fought the Act of 1870. He refused to sell his estate when the Wyndham Act offered him inducements and he resisted the Evicted Tenants Act of 1907. He made his last stand against the Act of 1909 and the conflict was settled in the Land Court on July 29, 1915. He died unmarried, and so the marquessate and other titles lapse, but the earldom passes to his cousin, the Marquis of Sligo.

— **Edward Anthony Beck** was born in 1848. He came up to Trinity Hall, Cambridge, as a scholar from Bishop Stortford Grammar School. He was twice awarded the Chancellor's medal for an English poem and also won the Seatonian prize. A tutor of the College from 1885, he succeeded his friend Henry Latham in the Mastership in 1902. He was Vice-Chancellor in the years 1904-5 and 1905-6.

— **Sir Algernon Francis Peyton**, the eldest son of Major-General Sir Thomas Peyton, was born in 1855. He succeeded his father as sixth baronet in 1888. He married in 1888 the third daughter of Mr. James Mason, by whom he had two sons and a daughter. The title passes to his elder son.

14. Charles Alfred Cooper was born in 1829, educated at the Hull Grammar School, and joined the staff of the *Hull Advertiser* as an apprentice. In 1861 he came to

London and took his place on the Parliamentary staff of the *Morning Star*; in the following year he became "Chief and only sub-editor." He was chosen in 1866 to be the London correspondent of the *Scotsman*; he afterwards became sub-editor and in 1876 he succeeded Alexander Russel as editor which position he held for thirty years. In 1907 the University of Edinburgh conferred on him the honorary degree of LL.D.

15. Alexander Meyrick Broadley was born in 1847, the eldest son of the late Canon Broadley. He was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn in 1869, and came into prominence during the trial of Arabi Pacha at Cairo after his surrender to the British forces in 1882, when he acted as senior counsel for Arabi. In 1881-82 he acted as Special Correspondent of *The Times* in Tunis and Egypt.

16. Dr. William George Peel, the Bishop of Mombasa, was born in India, and after being trained at the Church Missionary College, Islington, was ordained in 1879 with a title to the parish of Trowbridge. When in 1899 the diocese of Mombasa was formed out of a part of the diocese of Eastern Equatorial Africa, Dr. Peel was appointed its first Bishop. He came into prominence after the conference held at Kikuyu in June, 1913, between representatives of the various religious bodies working in British East Africa. A controversy was started lasting a long time, and was never really ended owing to the outbreak of the European War.

17. James A. Allan, a grandson of Captain Alexander Allan, the founder of the Allan Line, went to sea as a young man and obtained his master mariner's certificate. From 1884 until 1909 he was a director of the Allan Line. He was popularly described as the "Millionaire Socialist," and in 1907 offered himself as Socialist candidate for the Dennistown Ward of the Glasgow Town Council. For many years he was a member of the Fabian Society and the Independent Labour Party.

18. The Right Hon. Hugh Holmes, the son of the late Mr. William Holmes of Dungannon, was born in 1840. After graduating at Dublin University he was called to the Irish Bar in 1865, and he joined the North-West Circuit. He was Solicitor-General for Ireland under the Disraeli

Government in 1878 and held that office until 1880. He became Attorney-General in 1885. In 1887 he was made a Judge of the Queen's Bench Division. He sat in Parliament for Dublin University from 1885 to 1887, and in 1897 he was appointed a Lord Justice of Appeal.

19. Baron von der Goltz Pasha was born at Beilkenfeld in 1843, and entered the Prussian Infantry in 1861. When war broke out with France in 1870, he was first lieutenant in the 41st Regiment and was placed on the Headquarter Staff of Prince Frederick Charles, the commander of the Second Army. After the Franco-German War, von der Goltz was promoted Captain and entered the historical section of the General Staff. He afterwards for five years became lecturer in military history in Berlin. In 1883 he published "The Nation in Arms," by far the most famous of his works. In the same year he went to Turkey and entered on the great work of his life. He spent the next twelve years in reorganising the Turkish Army, making immense improvements in every branch and in 1895 he returned to Germany. In 1908 he returned to Constantinople and was from then identified with the Young Turk movement. He revisited Turkey in 1909 and again in 1910. In 1913 von der Goltz retired with the rank of Field-Marshal. After the German armies had overrun Belgium in 1914, he was for a short time Governor of Brussels; when, however, Turkey declared war on the Allies he went back to Constantinople.

21. Montagu White was educated at the Diocesan College, Cape Town, and entered the Cape Colonial Civil Service in 1874, resigning after four years. Later he went to the Transvaal, where he entered the Mining Department and was Mining Commissioner of Boksburg till 1892. In this same year he became Consul-General in London for the South African Republic, a post which he held until 1900. Mr. White came into prominence during the troubled times that preceded the outbreak of the South African War.

24. Major Sir Henry Paulet St. John Mildmay, Bt., was the eldest son of the fifth baronet and the Hon. Helena Shaw-Lefevre, second daughter of Viscount Eversley, and succeeded his father in 1902. He was born in 1853. He was formerly in

the Grenadier Guards and served in the Egyptian War of 1882. He died unmarried and is succeeded by his brother.

24. Brigade Commander (temporary Brigadier-General) Augustus de Ségur McKerrell, C.B., was born in 1863, educated at Cheam and Eton, and joined the Cameron Highlanders from Sandhurst in 1884. From 1893 to 1903 he was employed with the Egyptian Army. Afterwards he was successively Governor of Dongola and Berber, and he commanded the 2nd Battalion Cameron Highlanders from 1910 to 1912. He was created C.B. in 1908.

25. Brigadier-General Richard Menteith Greenfield, C.B., was born in 1857 and entered the Army in 1874, was gazetted Colonel in 1899 and retired in 1909, being granted the honorary rank of Brigadier-General in 1912. He saw active service in Burma in 1892-3 and was mentioned in dispatches, receiving the medal with clasps and the brevet of Lieutenant-Colonel. He commanded the Bombay Brigade from 1905 to 1909.

— **Thomas Wallis** was born in 1838, the son of another well-known art dealer, Henry Wallis. In 1862 he joined his father at the French Gallery in Pall Mall and for half a century he was one of the best known art dealers in London. He retired from business in 1910.

27. Brigade Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel W. Woodforde-Finden, I.M.S., was born in 1845 and obtained his first commission in 1866. He was on Lord Lytton's Staff at Simla in 1876 and on Sir Donald Stewart's Staff in Afghanistan in 1878-80. He took part in the march from Kabul with Lord Roberts to the relief of Kandahar, being mentioned in dispatches and receiving the medal with clasp and bronze star.

30. Earl St. Aldwyn-Michael Edward Hicks Beach was born in 1837 and educated at Eton and Christ Church. He afterwards succeeded his father as baronet and also as Conservative member for East Gloucestershire, a seat which he retained for twenty years. It was in 1865 that he entered Parliament and three years later he was appointed Parliamentary Secretary of the then Poor Law Board, and a few months afterwards Under-Secretary for the

Home Department. In 1874 Hicks Beach's party came back into office after five years of Opposition, and he was appointed to the important post of Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, but he did not enter the Cabinet until three years later. In 1877 he succeeded Lord Carnarvon as Secretary for the Colonies. In 1885 when Lord Salisbury came in Hicks Beach became Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons. This ministry lasted only a short time and the 1885 election brought in Mr. Gladstone. In the Salisbury Ministry that followed he again accepted the Irish Secretaryship, which post he resigned shortly after-

wards. He later re-entered the Cabinet as President of the Board of Trade, an office which he held until the fall of Lord Salisbury's Government in 1892. When the Conservatives came back to power in 1895 Sir Michael once more became Chancellor of the Exchequer and held that office for seven years. In 1906 he was made a peer with the title of Viscount St. Aldwyn and was raised to an earldom in 1915. He married twice, and by his second wife, Lady Lucy Fortescue, he had one son, who was killed in action a few weeks ago, and three daughters. He is succeeded by his grandson, born in 1912.

MAY.

1. **Vice-Admiral William McCoy Fitz-Gerald Castle** was the son of the late Vice-Admiral William Langford Castle, born in 1843. He entered the Navy in 1857 and retired after forty years at sea. He was acting commander of the *Egeria* during the operations in the Malay Peninsula in 1875-76, for which he received the Perak medal with clasp and was promoted to the rank of Commander. He held a captain's good service pension for a short period.

3. **William Ross Hardie**, born in 1862, received his first important education at Edinburgh University. From there he was elected to an open classical scholarship at Balliol in 1879. He had a brilliant career and won the Ireland and Hertford scholarships in the same year, 1882, as well as the two Gaisford prizes for Greek verse and prose. To these he added the Latin verse, the Craven and Derby scholarships, and the usual two first classes in the classical schools. In 1884 he was elected Fellow of Balliol, became Tutor at once and remained in residence until 1895, filling the office of Junior Proctor in 1893. In 1895 he was elected Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh.

4. **Admiral of the Fleet the Right Hon. Lord John Hay, G.C.B.**, the fourth son of the eighth Marquess of Tweeddale, was born in 1827. He entered the Navy at the age of 13, and in 1846 was promoted to be Lieutenant of the *Spiteful* under the command of Sir William Hoste. In 1851 he was made Commander; in 1854 he was specially promoted to be Captain for services in the trenches

before Sevastopol. In 1855 he received the Crimean medal with the Sevastopol clasp, the Turkish medal, the Medjidieh of the Fourth Class, and was made a Knight of the Legion of Honour. Also a few months later he was made C.B. In 1860 he went out to China. In 1866 and again from 1868 to 1871 he was a Lord of the Admiralty. In 1872 he became a Rear-Admiral; from 1877 to 1879 he was Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet. In 1880 Lord John Hay was again appointed a Lord of the Admiralty, where he stayed until 1883, when he accepted the Command-in-Chief in the Mediterranean. He had become a Vice-Admiral in 1877 and was nominated a K.C.B. in 1881. In 1884 he attained the rank of Admiral. During the short Liberal Ministry of 1886 he was First Naval Lord of the Admiralty, and in July of that year he was advanced to be a G.C.B. In 1887 he was appointed Commander-in-Chief at Devonport, and in 1888 he was promoted to the rank of Admiral of the Fleet. He was a staunch Liberal in politics, and in 1857 was returned to Parliament as member for Wick and in 1866 and in 1868 for Ripon. Lord John Hay married in 1876 Annie Christina, daughter of Mr. N. G. Lambert, M.P., of Denham Court, Bucks.

4. **John Murray** was a former Premier of Victoria. He became Chief Secretary and Minister of Labour in 1902, and afterwards Minister of Lands in the Ministry of Sir Thomas Bent. In 1909 he became Premier, but resigned that office in 1912.

10. **Lady Crookes**, wife of Sir William Crookes, O.M., the daughter

f Mr. W. Humphrey of Darlington, was born in 1836.

10. Deputy Surgeon-General Cyril James Mansfield, M.V.O., A.D., R.N., was a great-grandson of Sir James Mansfield, the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas. Born in 1861 and educated at Cheltenham and at Aberdeen, he entered the Navy in 1885. In 1905-9 he was Fleet Surgeon at the Royal Naval College, Osborne, and Deputy Surgeon-General at the Royal Naval Barracks, Chatham, 1914-15, and at Haslar, 1915-16.

— **Dr. Arthur Sampson Napier, D.Litt., F.B.A.,** was born in 1858 and educated at Rugby, Owens College, Manchester, Exeter College, Oxford, and the University of Berlin. He was Reader in English at the University of Berlin, 1878-82; Professor of English Language and Literature in the University of Göttingen, 1882-85; Corresponding Master of the Royal Academy of Science, Göttingen. Since 1885 he had been Merton Professor of English Language and Literature at Oxford, also from 1903 to 1914 Rawlinsonian Professor of Anglo-Saxon. He published numerous works.

11. Brigadier-General Frederick James Heyworth, C.B., D.S.O., was born in 1863. In 1883 he was gazetted Lieutenant in the Scots Guards from the Militia, obtaining his company in 1896 and his majority in 1900. He became Lieutenant-Colonel in 1908 and Colonel in 1911, and was appointed to the command of the Scots Guards in 1913. He was A.D.C. to the Brigadier-General, Curragh, 1890-91, and A.D.C. to the Major-General, Dublin District, until 1895. In the South African War he was with the Kimberley Relief Force. He received the D.S.O. in addition to the Queen's medal with six clasps and the King's medal with two clasps.

— **Sir Eustace James Clarke Jervoise, Bt.,** was the son of the late Alan Clarke Jervoise, and succeeded his uncle as sixth baronet in 1911. He was born in 1870. He held a commission at one time in the South Lancashire Regiment and saw service in the South African War. He is succeeded by his half-brother.

13. Miss Margaret Benson, born in 1866, was a daughter of the late Archbishop Benson and sister of Mr. A. C. Benson and Mr. E. F. Benson.

As a student at Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, she obtained a first class in Moral Science and wrote an excellent text-book in 1891 on "Capital, Labour, Trade and the Outlook." In 1908 she published a book of religious philosophy, "The Venture of Rational Faith." She was remarkable for the versatility of her mind, and besides works of a serious nature she wrote two little volumes of stories about animals, "Subject to Vanity" and "The Soul of a Cat."

13. Venerable Archdeacon Wilberforce, Albert Basil Orme Wilberforce, was born in 1841. He was the youngest child of Samuel Wilberforce, the famous Bishop of Oxford and of Winchester, and a grandson of the Emancipator. He was educated at Eton and at Exeter College, Oxford. After six months' reading at Cuddesdon College, he was ordained Deacon by his father in 1866, being raised to the priesthood in the following year. At the end of 1869 Basil Wilberforce enlarged his experience of parochial work in curacies, first at Seaton and afterwards at Southsea. In 1871 he was appointed to the highly important rectory of St. Mary's, Southampton. In 1875 he committed himself to the cause of teetotalism and also became a convinced and resolute opponent of vivisection. In 1894 Mr. Gladstone appointed him to a canonry at Westminster (of which he was made Archdeacon in 1906), coupled with the Rectory of St. John's. In 1895 he became Chaplain to the House of Commons, and from that time he withdrew himself gradually from public controversy.

14. Sir Reginald Archibald Edward Cathcart was the son of the fifth baronet, by Lady Eleanor Kennedy, a grand-daughter of the first Marquess of Ailsa, and was born in 1838. He succeeded his father in 1878, and married in 1880 the widow of Mr. John Gordon, of Cluny. The only child of the marriage died in infancy, and as Sir Reginald's brothers died many years ago, there is no heir to the baronetcy.

— **Professor E. J. Kylie** was born in Ontario in 1880, matriculated into Toronto University and from there went to Balliol College, Oxford, where he obtained first class honours in Modern History in 1903. He returned to Toronto University, where he was made a lecturer in history and subsequently became professor.

17. Sir Edward Lee French was born in 1857, the second son of the late Rev. F. French, and was educated at Marlborough. He entered the Indian Police in 1879, becoming Inspector-General of the North-West Frontier Police in 1908 and of the Punjab Police in the following year. He received the K.C.V.O. in 1911.

— **Colonel Arthur George Webster, C.B.**, who was in his 80th year, was educated at Cheltenham College. He entered the Army in 1856, became Lieutenant-Colonel in 1882, and retired in 1884 with the honorary rank of Colonel. He went through the Indian Mutiny and was awarded the medal. In the Egyptian Expedition, 1882, he took part in the battle of Tel-el-Kebir; for his services he received the medal with clasp, the Bronze Star of the Fourth Class of the Osmanieh. He commanded the 19th Hussars in the Sudan in 1884 at the battles of Teb and Tamai and was made a C.B.

— **Sir Corbet Woodall** was 75 years old. He became governor of the Gas Light and Coke Company in 1906. He was instrumental in inaugurating in 1909 the system of co-partnership which embraces many thousands of employees. At present the workers hold 156,000l. worth of stock. Sir Corbet was very popular with the company's employees and was also a generous giver to charities.

— **Rev. John Llewelyn Davies** was the son of the Rev. J. Davies, D.D., and was born in 1826. He was educated at Repton and went up, as a scholar, to Trinity College, Cambridge. He became president of the Union; he and D. J. Vaughan were the two Bell scholars of 1845 and they were bracketed as Fifth Classic in 1848. He was elected to a Fellowship at Trinity in 1851. In 1876 Queen Victoria made him one of her chaplains. In 1889 he left London for the Trinity living of Kirkby Lonsdale, which he held until 1908. Mr. Davies was a great personal friend of Frederick Denison Maurice and had been associated with him in the foundation of the Working Men's College in 1854. He was elected one of the members of the first London School Board in place of Professor Huxley, and worked with others of similar views for the friendly settlement of religious difficulties. He became Principal of Queen's College in Harley St., which Maurice had founded for the better education of women, and

took part in teaching classes at the Working Men's College.

20. Admiral Charles Windham, C.V.O., was the second and eldest surviving son of the late Lieutenant-General Sir Charles Ash Windham, born in 1851. Educated at Lee's School, Brighton, and in H.M.S. *Britannia*, he became a naval cadet in 1864, attained flag rank in 1905 and retired in 1909. He was promoted Vice-Admiral in 1910 and Admiral in 1913. From 1896 to 1901 he was in command of the Royal Yacht *Osborne* and for this service was made a C.V.O. He was appointed Gentleman Usher to King Edward in 1907 and subsequently to King George.

23. Brigadier-General Colquhoun Grant Morrison, C.M.G., who was born in 1860, was the second son of the late Lieutenant-Colonel Richard Fielding Morrison. He entered the Army in 1879, being gazetted Second Lieutenant in the Rifle Brigade. He became Major in the 1st Dragoons in 1897 and was promoted Colonel in 1911. From 1891 to 1897 he served as an instructor at the Royal Military College. In the South African War he was on the staff first as station commandant, Middleburg, and afterwards as administrator of an area, and was awarded the Queen's medal with three clasps. Early in the European War he was appointed President of the Claims Commission B.E.F., and for his services he was appointed C.M.G. in 1915.

— **Major Charles Herbert Mullins, V.C., C.M.G.**, born in 1869 at Grahamstown, Cape Colony, was educated at St. Andrew's College, Grahamstown, and Keble College, Oxford. He was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1893. He served in the South African Campaign with the Imperial Light Horse and won the V.C. Major Mullins was also appointed C.M.G. for his services in the war.

26. Dr. Joseph Ferguson Peacocke, born in Queen's County in 1835, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he had a distinguished career, graduating in 1857 as Senior Moderator in History and English. His first curacy was St. Mary's, Kilkenny, where he stayed three years. In 1878 he became Rector at Monks-town. He was made Prebendary of Dunlavin and Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, in 1875. In 1894

he was elected Bishop of Meath. When Lord Plunket died in 1897, Dr. Peacocke became his successor in the Archbishopric, which post he resigned in 1915.

28. Sir James Frederic Goodhart, Bt., M.D., was born in 1846. He took his M.B. at Aberdeen in 1871 with highest honours and his M.D. in 1873. In 1899 he received the honorary degree of LL.D. of that university. He was consulting physician at Guy's Hospital and also on the consulting staff of King Edward's Sanatorium. He was created a baronet in 1911.

29. The Hon. Mrs. Robert Dalzell was born in 1822, and married in 1846 Lieutenant-Colonel the Hon. Robert Dalzell, C.B., who died in 1878, fourth son of the ninth Earl of Carnwath. Her eldest son became fourteenth Earl of Carnwath on the death of his uncle, and was succeeded by his son in 1910.

29. James J. Hill was born at Rockwood, Canada, in 1838. At the age of 17 he found employment as shipping clerk in a firm of steamship agents, but in 1865 he struck out for himself as a commission agent and general contractor; and in 1870 with Mr. C. W. Griggs, under the name of Hill, Griggs & Co., he began the business of transportation as a principal. It was in 1876 that he began to set up his great fortune when the St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company became insolvent and he with others acquired the property at a foreclosure sale. He overcame many vicissitudes and finally became the dictator of the Northern Pacific.

— **Colonel John Mosby** was in his 83rd year. He was a famous partisan leader on the Confederate side in the American Civil War.

JUNE.

1. Most Rev. Enos Nuttall, D.D., was born in 1842. He entered the Wesleyan ministry and became famous as a preacher. In the early sixties he was accepted by the Wesleyans for service in Jamaica; but he later abandoned the connexion. In 1866 he was ordained deacon and priest by Bishop Courtenay and at once became "Island Ourate" of St. George's, Kingston. In 1880 he was elected Bishop of Jamaica; in 1888, owing to the growth of his work, Dr. Nuttall procured the appointment of an Assistant-Bishop. In 1893 he became Primate of the West Indies, but it was not until 1897 that he received the title of Archbishop.

5. Horatio Herbert Kitchener, the second son of Lieutenant-Colonel H. H. Kitchener, was born in County Kerry on June 24, 1850. Although born in Ireland he was of English descent. He was educated privately until the age of 13, when he was sent to Villeneuve, on the Lake of Geneva, in charge of the Rev. J. Bennett. He afterwards travelled abroad, and when he returned to London he was prepared for the Army by the Rev. George Frost. He entered the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich in 1868, and obtained a commission in the Royal Engineers in 1871. He was in France at the outbreak of the Franco-German War and volunteered for service in the French Army, but soon afterwards he had an

attack of pneumonia and was invalided home. In 1874 Kitchener accepted a post on the staff of the Palestine Exploration Society and remained in the Holy Land until 1878. He served through the Egyptian Campaign of 1882, and owing to his knowledge of Arabic became second in command of the Egyptian Cavalry when Sir Evelyn Wood was made Sirdar of the Egyptian Army. In 1884 Kitchener was a Major and D.A.A. and Q.M.G. on the Intelligence Staff. He accompanied Sir Herbert Stewart's column on its march to Metemmeh; when the expedition recoiled it became Kitchener's duty to give the account of the storming of Khartum and the death of Gordon. In June, 1885, he was promoted Lieutenant-Colonel. In 1886 he was appointed Governor-General of the Red Sea littoral and Commandant at Suakin in August, 1886. In June, 1888, he became Colonel and A.D.C. to Her Majesty Queen Victoria. He later rejoined the Egyptian Army as Adjutant-General, and for the success at Toski he was awarded a C.B. In 1892 Kitchener succeeded Grenfell as Sirdar and in 1894 was made a K.C.M.G. It was in 1896 that the reconquest of the Sudan was begun, and with the entry of Kitchener into Omdurman in 1898, Mahdi-ism was smashed to pieces and Gordon was avenged. Kitchener returned to England and received many honours and rewards. He was raised to the peerage

under the title of Baron Kitchener of Khartum, received the G.C.B. and was granted 30,000*l.* and the thanks of both Houses of Parliament. Kitchener was not to remain in England long; in 1899 Lord Roberts was appointed Commander-in-Chief in South Africa and Lord Kitchener went out with him as Chief of Staff. In November, 1900, Lord Roberts handed over the command to Kitchener, and it was generally supposed that the war was at an end; but Kitchener found that he had to cope with a considerable resistance on the part of guerilla bands which sprung up on all sides; he created a new defence force in Cape Colony and imported a new spirit of energy and enterprise into the conduct of the war so that the war was brought to an end and peace terms were signed on May 31, 1902. When Kitchener returned once more to England he was made a Viscount, and received the Order of Merit, the thanks of both Houses of Parliament and a substantial grant of public money. In this same year he was appointed Commander-in-Chief in India, and during the seven years he overcame many difficulties, and his efforts to improve the administrative and organic defects which he found in the army in India were very successful. On September 10, 1909, Kitchener was made Field-Marshal and he returned home by way of Australasia. On his return he was made a K.P. and was appointed High Commissioner and Commander-in-Chief in the Mediterranean in succession to the Duke of Connaught, but he resigned the appointment soon afterwards. In 1911 he accepted the post of British Agent and Consul-General in Egypt. On August 5, 1914, Kitchener, who happened to be in England when the European War broke out, was appointed Secretary of State for War. On the evening of June 5 he was drowned whilst on his way to Russia for military purposes. Kitchener was made a K.G. in 1915. During the European War he also received the Grand Cordon of the Legion of Honour and of the Order of Leopold. He was never married, and the earldom which was conferred on him in July, 1914, passed by special remainder to his elder brother.

5. Colonel Robert Parry Nisbet, C.I.E., was born in 1839 and educated at King's College, London. He was called to the Bar by the Middle Temple and afterwards became a Fellow of the University of London. In 1888 he became H.M. Resident in

Kashmir, retiring from the service in 1892.

6. Mrs. Frederic Harrison was born in 1852 and married Mr. Frederic Harrison in 1870. She took a very keen interest in the positivist philosophy of which her husband was so eminent a professor.

— **Yuan Shih-Kai** was born at Hsiang Cheng, in Honan, in 1859. His family had long been distinguished in the service of the State. Early in life after qualifying for the bachelor degree, he devoted himself to the then despised military profession, and at the age of 20 became aide-de-camp to General Wu Chang-ching, then commanding in Eastern Shantung. In 1884 Yuan was given the command of the Chinese garrison of Korea. In the following year he was appointed Imperial Resident. Yuan was entrusted by Li Hung-chang with the command of a new force of 5,000 men, to be trained experimentally by Western methods at a camp near Tientsin. This was the beginning of China's modern army, and was an all-important factor in the events of 1898, when the Empress Dowager again resumed power. In 1901 he was appointed to the Viceroyalty of Chihli, and his advice to the Throne was always in the direction of Constitutional government. In 1907 he gave up his post of Viceroy of Chihli to become the Administrative head of the Foreign Office at Peking and a member of the Grand Council, and China's foreign relations were never more ably conducted than at this period. After the death of the Empress Dowager he was dismissed from this post by the Manchu Cabal. He was recalled to office at the crisis of the Revolution in October, 1911, and was appointed President of the Council of Ministers on November 1, and became Prime Minister a fortnight later. He was elected Provisional President of the Chinese Republic on February 15, 1912, and on October 6, 1913, was elected President. The late summer of 1915 was marked by a movement in Peking for the restoration of monarchical government and Yuan-Shih-kai was voted as Emperor. The coronation was fixed for February 9, 1916, but the proposal for a Monarchy had been abandoned before that date, and the people of the South declared that Yuan had forfeited his position by his acceptance of the throne and proclaimed the Vice-President as President in his stead.

8. John Horace Savile, fifth Earl of Mexborough, was born in 1843, and succeeded his father in 1899. He was educated at Eton and Trinity, Cambridge, and had been High Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1877. His conversion to the Buddhist faith took place some years ago. The late peer was married three times. He leaves no direct heir and the title passes to his half-brother.

10. Admiral Henry Christian, M.V.O., was in his 89th year. He entered the Navy in 1841. In 1863 he became captain of the Royal Yacht *Victoria and Albert* and remained in command of the yacht until 1865, when he was chosen as Chief Constable of Gloucester, a post which he held for forty-five years. In recognition of the arrangements he made for the visit of King Edward to the Royal Show at Gloucester, he was appointed a member of the Victorian Order.

12. Count Szögyeny-Marich was 75 years of age. He was Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in Berlin from 1892 until June, 1914.

— **Sir Arthur Romney Stokes, Bt.,** was the son of Sir George Gabriel Stokes, F.R.S., and was educated at Charterhouse and King's College, Cambridge. He became one of the modern-side masters at Shrewsbury School in 1899. He succeeded his father in 1903, and married in 1897. He leaves no heir.

— **Professor Silvanus Phillips Thompson,** born in 1851, attended the Bootham (Friends') School and the Institute at Pontefract, and graduated at London University in 1869. Later he came to London to study at the Royal School of Mines. He graduated with high honours as B.Sc. in 1875 and proceeded to his doctor's degree in 1878. In this latter year he was appointed Professor of Experimental Physics in University College, Bristol, and in 1885 he was chosen Professor of Physics in the City and Guilds Technical College, Finsbury, of which he also became Principal. This position he held at the time of his death. Professor Thompson was an all-round physicist; he made several contributions to the theory of light, but perhaps he was best known for his work in electricity. His treatise on "Dynamo-Electric Machinery" published in 1884 is a standard work and has passed through a number of editions. Another very successful book was his "Elementary Lessons in

Electricity and Magnetism," and it has been translated into several foreign languages. He published many other scientific works and also three scientific biographies, one of Philip Reis, another of Faraday, and the third is a masterly account of the life of Lord Kelvin.

12. Stanley Hawley was 49 years of age. He was educated at the Royal Academy of Music and made his first appearance as a pianist at St. James's Hall in 1897. He made his mark principally as an accompanist, in which capacity he toured with Madame Patti (1906) and took part in many London concerts. He wrote many songs and piano pieces.

16. Brigadier-General H. J. Du Cane, C.B., M.V.O., served with distinction in the Hazara Expedition and throughout the South African War, and was afterwards Military Attaché at Sofia and Belgrade. On the outbreak of the European War he was appointed a General Staff Officer, first grade, and soon afterwards Brigadier-General on the Staff.

18. Helmuth von Moltke was 68 years of age. He was nephew of the famous Moltke who fought and won Bismarck's wars of aggression. He served as a Lieutenant in the 1870 campaign and in 1882 became personal aide-de-camp to his uncle, and on Moltke's death in 1891 he was appointed aide-de-camp to the Emperor. He became Major-General in 1899, and a Lieutenant-General in 1902. In 1906 he was appointed Chief of the General Staff in succession to Count Schlieffen; he identified himself with all its traditions and did not originate any new plans. When the war of 1914 broke out the plan of campaign—the rapid invasion of Belgium and lightning descent upon France during Russia's mobilisation, was carried out, and history has already recorded its failure. Early in December, 1914, it became known that he had been dismissed from his responsible post and succeeded by General von Falkenhayn.

19. Sir John Elijah Blunt, the son of Mr. Charles Blunt, sometime British Consul at Smyrna, was born in 1832. When the Crimean War broke out he was Acting Vice-Consul at Rhodes. Owing to his linguistic attainments he was employed in the Crimea as chief interpreter to the Cavalry Division, and was present at the battles of Alma, Balaklava and

Inkerman. On the conclusion of the war Blunt was sent to the Balkans and served there until 1899. He was Consul for Salonika, Priserend and Thessaly at the time of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877, and for the services he then rendered he was made a C.B. In 1879 he was promoted Consul-General at Salonika. In 1899 he was transferred to the Consulate at Boston, U.S.A., retaining his personal rank of Consul-General. He retired from the consular service in 1902, and was then knighted.

20. Right Hon. Sir Charles Dalrymple, Bt., the second son of Sir Charles Dalrymple Fergusson, Bt., of Kilkerran, was in his 77th year. He was educated at Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge, and sat in the House of Commons as a Conservative for Buteshire from 1868 to 1885. From 1886 to 1906 he represented Ipswich. He was Grand Master Mason of Scotland from 1893 to 1896. On the death of his father in 1849 he succeeded to the estates of Hailes in East Lothian and assumed the surname of Dalrymple. He was created a baronet in 1887.

— **Immelmann**, one of the most successful of the German airmen, was shot down on the Western Front. He was 26 years old and was born at Dresden.

— **Brigadier-General the Earl of Longford** was born in 1864 and succeeded his father as fifth Earl in 1887. In the same year he received his first commission in the 2nd Life Guards and was promoted Lieutenant in the following year. In 1895 he became Captain, and in the South African War served as Captain of the 45th Imperial Yeomanry, with the 2nd Life Guards, and as Lieutenant-Colonel of the Irish Horse. Lord Longford obtained his majority in the 2nd Life Guards in 1903, and was promoted Lieutenant-Colonel in 1906 and Colonel in 1909. In 1912 he commanded the 2nd South Midland Mounted Brigade and was appointed temporary Brigadier-General in August, 1914. He served in Gallipoli, and on August 21, 1915, was reported wounded and missing. On June 20, 1916, he was officially reported as killed. Lord Longford married in 1899 Lady Mary Julia Child-Villiers, daughter of the seventh Earl of Jersey, and leaves two sons and four daughters.

23. Dr. Charles Donald Maclean was born in 1843 and educated at

Shrewsbury and Exeter College, Oxford, of which he was a scholar. He was organist of his college and took his degree of Doctor of Music at the age of 22. For a few years he was organist and music director at Eton; but he went to India and held appointments chiefly in Madras. He returned to England in 1893 and became general secretary of the International Musical Society, and he was occupied with the affairs of the society up to the time of his death.

26. Hon. Henry Allen Rolls, heir-presumptive to Lord Llangatock, was 41 years of age. He was the second son of Lord Llangatock. His younger brother, the famous airman, was killed in a flying accident in 1910. There is now no heir to the title.

— **The Earl of Sandwich** was born in 1839 and educated at Eton. He entered the Grenadier Guards at the age of 18. In 1875 and the following year he was Military Secretary at Gibraltar, and in 1881 he was given the rank of Colonel. From 1876 to 1884, when he succeeded his father in the peerage, he sat in the House of Commons as member for Huntingdon. In later years he was thoroughly independent of party ties. In the course of his military career, Lord Sandwich was frequently engaged in diplomatic work. He was chairman of the Huntingdonshire County Council from its first formation and was three times Mayor of Huntingdon. Lord Sandwich was a great friend of King Edward VII., travelling with him in Canada and the United States in 1860 and often entertaining him privately at Hinchbrook. He was unmarried and is succeeded by his nephew.

— **Emile Waxweiler**, the eminent Belgian sociologist, was killed in London by a motor-car. Before the European War he was best known as the Director of the Solway Institute of Sociology at Brussels University. Among his best known works are "High Wages in the United States" and "Profit Sharing." Some time ago he was appointed by his Government to direct the Belgian "Office of Economic Studies," established in London to ascertain the needs of Belgian trade and industry.

27. Bishop Brindle, D.S.O., was born in 1837 of an old Lancashire family. He entered the Church at an early age and was ordained priest in the English College at Lisbon in 1862.

In 1874 he became an Army Chaplain and took part in many of the operations in which the British troops were engaged during the Egyptian and Sudanese Campaigns from 1882 to 1896. He was at this period three times mentioned in dispatches and received several decorations. In 1886 he returned to England and spent ten years at Colchester and Aldershot. In 1896 he joined Lord Kitchener on his expedition to Dongola. On the capture of Khartum he was one of the three chaplains who performed the Gordon memorial service. In November of the same year he was awarded the D.S.O. He retired from service in 1899. Bishop Brindle instructed the Princess Ena in connexion with her reception into the Roman Church, and he was subsequently present at her marriage with King Alfonso in the Cathedral of Toledo.

27. **Sir James Stirling** was the son of the Rev. James Stirling, born in 1836. Educated at the Grammar School and University of Aberdeen, he went to Trinity and was Senior Wrangler and first Smith's prizeman in 1860. Called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn in 1862, he started as a law reporter. He joined the "Law Reports" from their beginning in 1865 and reported in the Rolls Court till 1876. In 1881 he was appointed as Junior Counsel to the Treasury. In May, 1886, he became a Judge of the Chancery Division. In October, 1900, several legal changes were made and Stirling was made Lord Justice. In the vacation after the Easter sittings in 1906 the Lord Justice resigned his office, having sat on the Bench for about twenty years.

28. **Don Vicente Dominguez** died in London. He had been Argentine Minister to Great Britain since 1911, having previously acted as private secretary to the Argentine Ministers in Peru, Brazil, the United States and England. In 1891 he was appointed First Secretary of the Legation in Madrid and was transferred to Washington in 1895, Paris in the following year, and to London in 1899.

— The Foreign Office received the following telegram from the German Foreign Office, through the American

Embassy at Berlin: "Body of Major Viscount Crichton, M.V.O., Royal Horse Guards, found. He has been reinterred in cemetery at Wervico Nord." Lord Crichton had been missing since November, 1914.

Henry William Crichton, Viscount Crichton, M.V.O., D.S.O., was born in 1872, the eldest son of the fourth Earl of Erne, who died on December 2, 1914. Lord Crichton was educated at Eton and Sandhurst. He was appointed Second Lieutenant in the Royal Horse Guards in May, 1894, and became Captain in 1900, Major in 1910, and Lieutenant-Colonel on November 7, 1914. He was awarded the D.S.O. for his services in the defence of Ladysmith. In 1901 he was A.D.C. to the King (the Duke of Cornwall) during his Colonial tour, and from 1901-10 served as equerry to his Majesty (then Prince of Wales). He was equerry to the King until 1914. He was mentioned in Lord French's dispatches. Lord Crichton married in 1908 Lady Mary Cavendish Grosvenor, fifth daughter of the first Duke of Westminster. The title passes to Lord Crichton's only son.

30. **Sir Gaston Maspero**, the well-known Egyptologist, was born in Paris in 1846. He early developed a taste for his future study and in 1867 he was quite competent to translate newly-found hieroglyphic texts. In 1880 when it was decided to establish a French Archaeological Mission in Cairo, Maspero was selected as its director, but on the death of Mariette in 1881 he was transferred to the direction of Bulaq Museum. He remained at this post six years and then resumed his professional duties at the Collège de France. He spent twelve years at home, and during that time he wrote his great "Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient Classique" (three vols., 1895-97) and his handbook on Egyptian archaeology. In 1899 Maspero was appointed a second time to the directorship of the Service of Antiquities in Egypt. He did invaluable work during his second term of office and his opinion was indispensable on almost any point of Egyptology. He retired in 1914. In 1887 he had been made an honorary D.C.L. by Oxford and in 1909 he was created an honorary K.C.M.G.

JULY.

1. **James Bromley Eames** was born in 1873 and graduated at Worcester College, Oxford, in 1895. Three years later, after he had taken the B.C.L. degree and had been called to the Bar by the Middle Temple, he was appointed Professor of Law at the Tientsin University. When the Boxer rising began in 1900 he joined the Tientsin Volunteers, who took part in the relief of the Legations. For this service he received the medal with clasp. In 1901 he returned to England and went the Western Circuit. In 1914 he was selected for the Recorder-ship of Bath. His ability as a lawyer was recognised when he was chosen to be a joint editor of "Odgers on Libel."

4. **Sir James Talbot Power**, head of the distillery in Dublin which bears his name, was born in 1851, and succeeded his nephew as the fifth baronet in December, 1914. He married in 1877 but there was no issue of the marriage, and he is succeeded in the baronetcy by his brother, Mr. Thomas Talbot Power.

6. **Arthur Antwis Hopkins**, born in 1855, was the eldest son of the late John Satchell Hopkins, J.P., of Edgbaston, Birmingham. He was educated at Rugby, where he was an exhibitor, and he afterwards graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple in 1879, and after eleven years' practice on the Midland Circuit he succeeded Mr. D'Eyncourt as magistrate at Lambeth, where he served for twenty-three years. In 1913 he was appointed to Bow Street in succession to Sir Henry Curtis Bennett.

7. **Sir Edward Charles Buck, K.C.S.I.**, born in 1838, was educated at Oakham School, Norwich, and at Clare College, Cambridge. He graduated in Law in 1861. In 1860 he passed the Indian Civil Service Examination and was posted to the United Provinces, where in 1874 he was made Director of the newly-formed Agricultural Department. He retired in 1896, and on his retirement was made an honorary Fellow of Clare. In 1886 he received a knighthood and ten years later the K.C.S.I. He will always be remembered as the pioneer of the agricultural progress of India.

8. **Sir Edwin Henry Egerton, G.C.M.G., K.C.B.**, was born in 1841,

the third son of the Rev. Thomas Egerton, rector of Middle, Shropshire. He entered the Diplomatic Service in 1859 and served in Buenos Aires, Athens, Egypt, Constantinople and Paris; he was British Minister in Athens from 1892 to 1903, Ambassador in Madrid in 1903-4 and in Rome from 1904-8. Sir Edwin married in 1895 Olga, daughter of Prince Nicolas Lobanow Rostowski and widow of Michael Katkow.

8. **Admiral Sir St. George Caulfield D'Arcy-Irvine, K.C.B.**, was the third son of the Rev. Gorges Marcus Irvine, born in 1833. He entered the Navy in 1845 and served in the River San Juan Expedition in Nicaragua, and in the Black Sea and Baltic during the Crimean War; he went up the Dardanelles during the Turco-Russian War of 1878 and commanded the *Penelope* at the bombardment of Alexandria. As Senior Lieutenant in the *Doris* he escorted King Edward as Prince of Wales during his tour in the East in 1862. He was second in command of the Channel Squadron in 1888-9.

9. **Mrs. M'Kenny Hughes**, wife of the Woodwardian Professor of Geology at Cambridge, died at the age of 54. She was keenly interested in her husband's work and collaborated with him in writing the volume on Cambridge for the *Cambridge County Geographies*. But the subject on which she was one of the highest authorities in the land was the distribution of land and fresh-water molluscs. She wrote numerous papers for scientific journals.

— **Sir William Wallace, K.C.M.G.**, was in his 60th year. He served his apprenticeship as an engineer at Glasgow. Before he was 20 he entered the service of the Niger Company and became one of the pioneers of the West Coast of Africa. During the thirty years he served in that country he concluded numerous treaties with native potentates. He was the first white man to enter Sokoto, and he had penetrated far inland before King Premph's power was broken. At the transfer of the territories to the Crown in 1900, Sir William Wallace joined the Government service as Resident-General and was Deputy High Commissioner and

Acting Governor of Northern Nigeria until 1910, when he retired.

12. James Sant, C.V.O., R.A. (retired), was born in 1820 and was first taught painting by John Varley, whose water-colour landscapes were greatly admired. At the age of 20 he went to the schools of the Royal Academy. He began to exhibit at once and since that time he rarely missed an Exhibition. He was elected A.R.A. in 1861, and became full R.A. in 1870, and next year showed his diploma picture, "The Schoolmaster's Daughter." In the same year he succeeded Sir George Hayter as Painter-in-Ordinary to Queen Victoria. Before that time he had painted large numbers of portraits, chiefly amongst the aristocracy. On receiving his Royal appointment he was commissioned to paint a large picture of Queen Victoria and the three eldest children of the Prince of Wales. His best pictures were those where he idealised children and young women, and his first success was in 1853 with his "The Infant Samuel." Another, which he painted thirty-five years later, "The Soul's Awakening," was much appreciated by the public. He retired from the active membership of the Royal Academy in 1914 and in the same year was created C.V.O. Mr. Sant showed a picture in the Academy Exhibition of 1915, and for long-lived activity among painters was only rivalled by the late Sidney Cooper.

— **Sir Stair Agnew, K.C.B.**, the son of Sir Andrew Agnew, Bart. of Lochnaw, was born in 1831. He went to Trinity College, Cambridge, and rowed in the University Boat-race of 1854. He was called to the Scottish Bar and became the legal secretary to the Lord Advocate. In 1870 he was appointed Queen's Remembrancer for Scotland and Keeper of Records, retiring in 1909.

— **Prince Gebhard Blücher von Wahlstatt**, who was head of his house, was born in 1886, as the eldest son of the second Prince. He was with the Cuirassiers of the Guard at the battles of Skalit and Königgrätz. He had a great liking for all that was British, and but for the world war he would not have returned to Germany.

— **William Trotman Stower Hewett** was born in 1840. From 1863 to 1893 he was one of the Deputies of the Shorthand Writer to the two Houses of Parliament. In 1898 he

went to Canada as private secretary to the Governor-General, Lord Aberdeen. In 1898 he returned to England and became secretary of the National Memorial to Mr. Gladstone. He also acted as one of the private secretaries to the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and after Sir Henry's death he was engaged in similar work for Mr. Asquith. Mr. Hewett was the author of various writings for boys and young men.

12. Captain Cecil Eardley-Wilmot was formerly in the Cheshire Regiment. He became Deputy-Governor of Wandsworth Prison in 1890 and was afterwards Governor of Lincoln, Canterbury, Borstal and Parkhurst Prisons. He was appointed one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Prisons in 1904, becoming a Commissioner in 1909.

16. Professor Metchnikoff or Elias Mecznirow, which was his correct name, was born in 1845 in the Russian province of Kharkoff. His father was a Russian officer of the Imperial Guard, and his mother was of Jewish origin. From his childhood Metchnikoff showed a strong taste for the study of nature. At the age of 17 he entered the University of Kharkoff, and in 1864 he went to Germany for further biological training. Before he returned to Russia in 1867 he had travelled much in pursuit of his studies. In that year he presented his thesis for the doctorate and was made "docent" in Zoology first at Odessa and then at Petrograd, and after a few months there was appointed in 1870 "Professor Ordinarius" of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy at Odessa. In 1882 Metchnikoff went to Messina, and it was there that his views with regard to "phagocytes" took shape. He wrote a memoir entitled "The Struggle of the Organism against Microbes." This subject took such hold on him that his zoological studies were put aside and he became henceforth a pathologist. In 1888, requiring greater facilities for his work, he went to Pasteur in Paris, who gave him a laboratory in the Ecole Normale. He continued to work with great success in Paris, and there was an ever-growing body of investigators who came to work in his laboratory, and his views on the essential importance of "phagocytosis" in resistance to disease were firmly established. In 1892 he produced a fully illustrated volume on "The Comparative Pathology of Inflammation." In 1901 he published his great book on "Immunity

in Infectious Diseases." In later years he started to study the bacterial flora of the alimentary canal. This led him to suggest a diet which included sour milk and excluded alcohol. His popularly written book, "The Nature of Man," published in 1903 and translated into English, gained for this part of his work greater publicity than his works on phagocytosis, inflammation and immunity. Metchnikoff was an honorary D.Sc. of Cambridge, a foreign member and Copley medallist of the Royal Society, a member of the Institute of France and of the Academy of Sciences of Petrograd. In 1908 he was awarded the Nobel medal and prize for his researches on immunity.

16. **Sir Victor Horsley** died of heat stroke while serving as consultant with the Forces in Mesopotamia. Sir Victor volunteered for service in Mesopotamia in March and his unselfish offer was accepted. At first he was stationed at the base at Basra, but within a short time he passed up to Amara, where his death took place. Born in 1857, the son of the late J. C. Horsley, R.A., he received his medical education at University College Hospital. He was not only a distinguished surgeon but he was a pioneer in the field of scientific medicine; his work on the surgery of the brain, as also the experimental study of the ductless glands, are examples of his supreme success in this branch. He took an active interest in social questions, and his hatred of alcohol and his efforts to restrict the sale and use of it are well known; also his championship of the woman suffrage movement is equally well known. He contested the University of London as a Liberal and was prospective candidate for Market Harborough on temperance and woman suffrage lines, although he was afterwards refused the support of the officials. He was Vice-Chairman of the London County Council Sub-Committee of Inquiry into the Medical Inspection and Treatment of School Children. In 1885 he was Secretary to the Royal Commission on Hydrophobia; from 1891-93 he was Fullerian Professor at the Royal Institution; from 1893-96 he was Professor of Pathology to University College. He was first medallist of the Lannelongue International Prize in Surgery in 1911; Royal Medallist of the Royal Society; LL.D. and D.C.L. Montreal and McGill University; Foreign Associate of the Academy of Medicine, Paris, and of the Academy of Wissenschaft, Berlin; member of the Science Society of

Sweden in succession to Lord Lister; member of learned societies in Rome, Petrograd, Budapest, Vienna, and Philadelphia. He was awarded the Cameron gold medal and the Fothergill gold medal and was first Chairman of the representative meeting of the British Medical Association. He held the post of surgeon to the National Hospital for Paralysis and Epilepsy in 1886, and was Émeritus Professor of Clinical Surgery and consulting surgeon at University College Hospital. He held the degree of M.D. (Halle) and was a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons and of the Royal Society. He was knighted in 1902.

17. **Alfred Lubbock**, son of Sir John Lubbock, third Baronet and a younger brother of the first Lord Avebury, was 70 years of age.

— **Mrs. Max Müller**, widow of the Right Hon. Frederick Max Müller, the orientalist and philologist, died at the age of 81. She was married to Max Müller in 1859 and after his death in 1900 she edited his "Life and Letters."

19. **Lord Clifford of Chudleigh** was born in 1851, the eldest son of the eighth baron. He was educated at Stonyhurst and called to the Bar. He was head of an old Roman Catholic family and was a Count of the Holy Roman Empire. He was A.D.C. to the King and an old volunteer and vice-chairman of the Devon Territorial Force Association. He married in 1890, but there was no issue of the marriage, and he is succeeded by his brother, the Hon. William Hugh Clifford.

— **Lord Newborough**, Sir William Charles Wynn, fourth Baron (Ireland) and a Baronet of England, was born in 1873 and succeeded his grandfather in the peerage in 1888, his father having died ten years before. He was educated at Heidelberg and at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, was formerly a Lieutenant in the Derbyshire Yeomanry and held a temporary commission as Lieutenant in the Welsh Guards. He married, in 1900, Grace Bruce, daughter of the late Colonel H. M. Carr, who survives him without issue. His heir-presumptive to the barony is his brother, Temporary Lieutenant the Hon. Thomas John Wynn, R.N.V.R.

— **Sir Foster Hugh Egerton Cunliffe, Bart.**, who was previously believed to be missing and wounded, is

reported to have been killed in action in France. The eldest son of the late Sir Robert Cunliffe, M.P., he was born in 1875 and succeeded his father as sixth Baronet in 1905. He was educated at Eton and at New College, Oxford. He was a remarkably successful cricketer, and as a left-hand bowler he played for the University from 1895-98. He obtained honours in the School of Modern History and was elected a Fellow of All Souls in 1898. In 1905 he was appointed to be the first Lecturer on Military History at Oxford. Cunliffe contested two bye-elections as a Liberal-Unionist, but without success. In December, 1914, he joined one of the new battalions of the Rifle Brigade, in which he quickly rose to the rank of Major. In 1915 he went to France, where he was killed in action. Sir Foster Cunliffe was unmarried and is succeeded in the baronetcy by his brother.

19. **M. Rik Wouters**, the young Belgian sculptor and painter, died in Holland at the age of 30. When the European War broke out Wouters was among the first to be called to the colours, and took part in the defence of Liège and Antwerp. He was interned near Amsterdam, where he soon became very ill. His bronze statue "Attitude" attracted considerable attention at the Royal Academy in 1915, as did his portrait busts at the Grosvenor Gallery.

22. **Sir W. Bowyer-Smijth**, twelfth Baronet, was in his 76th year. Educated at Eton, he entered the Diplomatic Service in 1858. He was secretary of Legation at Yeddo in 1881, the year in which he retired. He is succeeded in the title by his cousin.

— **Edgar Albert Smith, I.S.O., F.R.S.**, formerly Senior Assistant Keeper at the Natural History Museum, South Kensington, died at the age of 68.

23. **Cyrus Cuneo**, the artist and illustrator, was born in San Francisco in 1879. He studied in Paris for four years, where he worked in Whistler's studio. On leaving Paris he went to America for six months and then came to England. His work in the *Illustrated London News*, and his illustrations of Rider Haggard's stories, besides other novels, have made his work familiar to a very large public.

— **Sir Robert Gray Cornish Mowbray** died at the age of 66. He

was the eldest son of the first Baronet, whom he succeeded in 1899, and was educated at Eton and Balliol. In 1873 he was elected a Fellow of All Souls, in which year he was also President of the Union. He was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple in 1876, and was secretary to the Royal Commission on the Stock Exchange for the two following years. He entered the House of Commons in 1886 as Conservative member for Prestwick and afterwards sat for Brixton. For several years he was Parliamentary private secretary to Lord Goschen as Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was twice Prime Warden of the Goldsmiths' Company. Sir Robert was unmarried and is succeeded by his brother.

23. **Sir William Ramsay**, who was a nephew of the Scottish geologist, Sir A. C. Ramsay, came of a family which had been concerned with chemical processes for seven generations. Born in 1852, he attended Glasgow University until at the age of 18 he went to study Chemistry under Bunsen at Heidelberg and then under Fittig at Tübingen. He returned to Glasgow in 1872 and joined the staff of the University. In 1880 he was appointed Professor of Chemistry at University College, Bristol, of which he became Principal a year later. In 1887 he succeeded to the Chair of Chemistry at University College, London, remaining there till 1913. His name is best known for his discovery of the "inert gas" of the atmosphere. In recognition of his scientific work Ramsay, who was made a K.C.B. in 1902, received many medals and prizes, including a Nobel prize in 1904. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1888 and served as President of the British Association in 1911. He was the author of many works, the chief of which were "System of Inorganic Chemistry" (1891), "The Gases of the Atmosphere" (1896), "Modern Chemistry" (1902), and "Essays Biographical and Chemical" (1908).

— **James Whitcomb Riley**, the "Hoosier Poet," was born in 1849 in Indiana. He started life as a journeyman sign-writer, and when he could find no work would earn money with a home-made song. In 1875 these Hoosier poems began to appear in local journals, but in 1883 the publication of "The Old Swimmin' Hole" and "Seven More Poems," gave him a reputation beyond his native state. In 1912 the American Academy of Arts

and Letters awarded him their gold medal for poetry.

24. **Miss S. Macnaughtan**, the novelist, was the daughter of the late Peter Macnaughtan, J.P. Her early life was spent in visiting all parts of the world. She became a nurse and tended the victims of the Balkan atrocities, and in the South African War she distributed Red Cross comforts to the sick and wounded. After the outbreak of the European War she joined Mrs. St. Clair Stobart's unit in September, 1914, and as head orderly worked during the siege of Antwerp. Afterwards she joined Dr. Hector Munro's Ambulance at Ostend, and on 22 October moved up to Furnes, where they were shelled out, but Miss Macnaughtan continued her good work near La Pannex; later she was awarded the Order of Leopold. It was as a novelist that she was known to the world at large, and her books, "The Fortune of Christina McNab," "A Lame Dog's Diary," "The Expensive Miss Du Cane," had a large reading public.

25. **General Sir Henry John Thoroton Hildyard, G.C.B.**, was born in 1846 and educated at the Royal Naval Academy, Gosport. He served in the Navy from 1859-64. In 1867 he entered the Army, became Captain in the Highland Light Infantry in 1876, and at the beginning of the South African Campaign had attained the rank of Major-General. He served with the Egyptian Expedition in 1882 as D.A. and Q.M.G. He was present at Kassassin and Tel-el-Kebir, was mentioned in dispatches, and received the medal and clasp and the bronze star, fourth Class Osmanieh. Afterwards he was A.A.G. at Aldershot, and from 1893-98 was Commandant at the Staff College. For his services during the South African War he received the medal with five clasps, and was awarded the honour of K.C.B. After the war General Hildyard was Director-General on the Staff commanding troops in South Africa in 1904-5, and General Officer Commanding-in-Chief in South Africa from 1905-8.

— **Sir Francis George Augustus Fuller-Elliott-Drake** was born in 1837 and served for twelve years in the Royal Horse Guards, retiring in 1870, when he succeeded his uncle, the first baronet under a new creation—the original baronetcy having expired in 1794. Sir Francis married in 1861 the daughter of Sir Robert Douglas,

second baronet of Glenbervie. There is no heir to the title.

28. **Sir William Power, K.C.B., F.R.S., F.R.C.S.**, the distinguished sanitarian and epidemiologist, was a pioneer in public health work. In 1871, when the Local Government Board was constituted to deal with public health questions, Mr. Power was appointed a medical inspector of the new department. From 1887 to 1900 he was assistant medical officer and from 1900 to 1908 was principal medical officer of the Board. He was a Crown nominee to the General Medical Council, and succeeded Sir M. Foster as chairman of the Royal Commission on Human and Animal Tuberculosis; he largely directed the experimental work. He was created K.C.B. in 1908 and was the recipient of the Buchanan Medal of the Royal Society.

30. **Colonel Sir William Sinclair Smith Bisset, K.C.I.E., late R.E.**, was 73 years of age. He entered the Royal Engineers in 1863, and three years later joined the Public Works Department in India. In 1870 he superintended the survey which prepared the way for the construction of the Darjeeling and Himalayan Railway. In 1872 he became deputy consulting engineer for guaranteed railways in the Calcutta Circle. In 1877 he was on special duty in connexion with the Madras famine relief works. Later he served in the Afghan War, when he gained the medal and the brevet rank of Major. In 1893 he became acting Director-General of Railways, and later he became Secretary to the Government of India—the highest post in the Public Works Department. In 1897 he was knighted and returned to England to become Government Director of Indian Railways. He retired from the India Office in 1901.

— **Admiral Sir John Ommanney Hopkins, G.C.B.**, the son of the Rev. W. T. Hopkins, was born in 1834, and after a few years at Marlborough entered the Navy in 1848. In 1867 whilst serving in the *Royal Oak* in the Mediterranean, he was advanced to the rank of Captain. In 1869 he was Captain of the *Liverpool*; in 1872 he commanded the *Narcissus*; and in 1875 he accepted the post of Flag-Captain to Sir Thomas Symonds, then Commander-in-Chief at Devonport. In 1880 he was appointed Captain of the *Excellent*, which he left the following year to become secretary to the First Lord of the Admiralty. In 1883

he became Director of Heavy Ordnance, which post he held till 1886. He attained his flag in 1885, and in 1886 he was appointed Superintendent of Portsmouth Dockyard. From July, 1888, to February, 1892, he was a Junior Lord of the Admiralty, and having become a Vice-Admiral in 1891 he was appointed Commander-in-Chief on the North America and West Indies

station, where he remained for three years. On May 25, 1892, he was nominated a K.C.B., and on November, 1896, he was promoted to the rank of Admiral, and afterwards appointed to the Mediterranean Command, where he remained until his retirement in 1899. He was created a G.C.B. a month before he retired.

AUGUST.

2. **Hamish MacCunn**, the composer, was born in 1868. He was one of the first composition scholars elected at the opening of the Royal College of Music in 1883, and he studied there under Sir Hubert Parry. His compositions both orchestral and choral were produced at the Crystal Palace Concerts. MacCunn's overture "Land of the Mountain and the Flood" was the first to appear, and it is still played at Queen's Hall. Other orchestral pieces were "The Ship o' the Fiend" and "The Dowie Dens o' Yarrow," and of his cantatas "Lord Ullin's Daughter" and "The Lay of the Last Minstrel" were the most successful. Later he turned to opera, and his "Jeanie Deans" was produced in Edinburgh by the Carl Rosa Opera Company in 1894. In 1910 and in 1915 he again came forward as a conductor of opera; at Covent Garden and His Majesty's Theatre in 1910 and the English Opera at the Shaftesbury Theatre in 1915.

— **Samuel Twining**, of the well-known firm of bankers and tea merchants, died at the age of 68. He was educated at Harrow and Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

5. **Sir Arthur Markham, Bt., M.P.**, was born in 1866. He entered Parliament as Liberal member for the Mansfield Division of Notts at the General Election of 1900. He retained the seat with ease at each succeeding election. From the first he showed himself aggressive and independent. In 1909 he threw himself with great enthusiasm into the campaign for Mr. Lloyd George's Budget. He was created a Baronet in 1911. Sir Arthur came into great prominence in 1915 by his day by day criticism of the Coalition Government; he demanded efficiency and a more vigorous prosecution of the war. He married in 1898 and had three sons and one daughter; he is succeeded in the title by his son, born in 1899.

5. **Frederick William Frankland** died recently in New York. The eldest son of the late Sir Edward Frankland, K.C.B., F.R.S., he was born in 1854 and educated at University College, London. He had a brilliant career, more especially as a student of mathematics. His views on mathematical and metaphysical questions were given in his work "Thoughts on Ultimate Problems," which was published a few years ago and which has passed through a number of editions. His reputation as an actuary led to his being appointed to posts in London and in New York, and from 1914 he acted as consulting actuary to the Equitable Insurance Company of New York.

6. **John Spencer Curwen** was the head of the well-known firm of music publishers which bears his name. He was born in 1848 and educated at the Royal Academy of Music; he succeeded his father as president of the Tonic Solfa College in 1880 and lectured on the system throughout the United Kingdom. He wrote several works on musical matters.

— **Colonel Arthur Moffatt Lang, C.B., R.E.**, was born in 1832 and obtained his first commission in the Royal Engineers in 1852. He was an Indian Mutiny veteran and took part in the siege and capture of Delhi, the battles of Bulandshahr, Aligarh, Akliapore, and Agra, relief and capture of Lucknow, the battle of Cawnpore and action at Bari, for which he was mentioned in dispatches four times. He was also recommended for the V.O. for his gallantry during that campaign. He afterwards acted as Principal of Rurki Engineering College, Deputy Inspector General of Fortifications, Chief Engineer in Baluchistan, Burma, and North-West Provinces, and retired in 1888.

— **Lady Faudel-Phillips** was the fourth daughter of Mr. J. M. Levy, founder of the *Daily Telegraph*. She

married in 1867 Sir George Faudel-Phillips, first Baronet, by whom she had two sons and three daughters.

7. Professor Thomas Nicol, D.D., was one of the most distinguished of Scottish theologians. Born in 1846, he graduated in Arts at Aberdeen University, where he won the Greek prize and the Hutton prize for Latin, and achieved the unusual combination on graduation in 1868 of first-class honours in classics and mental philosophy. He took his divinity course at Edinburgh University, graduating in 1871. In 1899 he was appointed Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism at Aberdeen University. In 1914 he was appointed Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

— **Admiral Baron Hikonojo Kamimura**, the Japanese Supreme Councillor of the Admiralty, was born in 1849 at Kagoshima Satsuma. He joined the Navy in 1871. He was promoted Commander and later Captain of the cruiser *Akitsushima* during the war with China. He was Rear-Admiral in 1899, and in 1903 became Vice-Admiral and Chief of the Educational Bureau. During the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-5 he commanded the armoured cruiser squadron. In 1907 he was created a Baron. He was promoted Admiral in 1910 and later joined the Supreme War Council. He spent three years in England (1900-8) as chief Japanese naval inspector.

8. Lady Victoria Buxton, the only surviving child of the first Earl of Gainsborough, was born in 1839. She was a god-daughter of Queen Victoria, to whom her mother was a Lady-in-Waiting for 40 years. She was married in 1862 to Sir Thomas Powell Buxton, third Baronet, who died in October, 1915.

10. Charles Dawson, F.G.S., the discoverer of the famous Piltdown skull, died at the age of 52. He was a solicitor. He took a keen interest in the geology of Southern Sussex, and was particularly interested in the gigantic reptiles found in the Wealden formation of the coast.

11. The Rev. Sidney Faithhorn Green was a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, and was ordained by the Bishop of Manchester in 1865. He came prominently before the public in the ritual prosecutions of 1879. He was imprisoned in Lancaster Castle

in 1881, being declared guilty of contumacy and contempt, but was released after he had been in Lancaster Gaol about a year and eight months on the ground that his imprisonment had satisfied his contempt. Mr. Green served as curate and later as rector and in 1914 was appointed by the Lord Chancellor to the rectory of Luddenham, Faversham, but resigned in the following year and thereafter held no charge.

14. The Right Hon. Sir George Turner, P.C., K.C.M.G., was born at Melbourne in 1851. He was a member of the Victoria Bar, and first took office in the Victoria Government in 1891 as Minister of Health. He was twice Premier of Victoria and represented the State in London at the Diamond Jubilee. In 1901 he joined the first Commonwealth Ministry as Treasurer. He retired from politics in 1906.

15. James Connell, a member of the well-known firm of Messrs. James Connell & Son, art dealers, of Glasgow and London, died in his 84th year. He dealt chiefly in the pictures by artists of the Barbizon and other modern Continental schools, as well as in original etchings by modern artists.

16. Sir Richard Barter died in his 79th year. He was keenly interested in stock breeding and was at one time president of the Clerk Agricultural Society. He received a knighthood in 1911.

— **F. Pollard**, the picture dealer and art connoisseur, was born in 1826. He was the oldest living print dealer in London and his knowledge of English prints, and particularly those after Morland, was unrivalled.

17. Lord Redesdale, Algernon Bertram Mitford, born in 1837, was the son of Henry Evelyn Mitford and Lady Georgina Ashburnham, a daughter of the Earl of Ashburnham. He was educated at Eton and at Christ Church and entered the Foreign Office in 1858. In 1863 he was attached to the Embassy at Petrograd, but only remained there six months. In the spring of 1865 he was sent to Peking where he acquired a considerable knowledge of Chinese both spoken and written. He did not remain long in China, for in September, 1866, he was transferred to Japan. In March, 1868, he was promoted to be a second

Secretary. He soon began to master the Japanese language, and when the Duke of Edinburgh visited Japan in September, 1869, Mitford was his interpreter. In 1870 he returned to England on leave, and in the following year he was appointed to Petrograd, but did not take up his post there and he resigned in August, 1873. The following year he was appointed to be Secretary to the Commissioners of Public Works and Buildings, an office which he held till 1886, when he resigned. In 1882 he was made a C.B. In 1886 he succeeded to the estates and other property of his cousin, the second Earl of Redesdale. He sat in Parliament as a Conservative for the Stratford Division of Warwick from July, 1892, until the dissolution in June, 1895. He did not stand again owing to deafness, which made it difficult for him to take part in debate. In 1902 he was raised to the peerage as Baron Redesdale of Redesdale in Northumberland. In 1905 he received the G.C.V.O. and in 1906 the K.C.B. In 1906 he was attached to Prince Arthur of Connaught's special mission to Tokyo to invest the late Emperor of Japan with the Order of the Garter. In 1871 he brought out a two-volume work on Japanese literature in the shape of its romances, novels, historical and popular tales, with illustrations drawn and engraved by Japanese artists. The work had a tremendous sale and has been translated into Polish and German. During the next few years he directed his attention to gardening and his experiences are given in "The Bamboo Garden," illustrated by Alfred Parsons and published in 1896. In November, 1915, he published his "Memoirs." Lord Redesdale married in 1874, Lady Clementine Ogilvy, daughter of the seventh Earl of Airlie, by whom he had five sons and four daughters. He is succeeded in the title by his second son; his eldest son was killed in action in May, 1915, leaving no issue.

17. Hon. Mrs. Richard Boyle ("E. V. B.") died recently at the age of 91. She was a younger daughter of Alexander Gordon of Ellon, and in 1845 married the Rev. the Hon. Richard Cavendish Boyle. Her books with their fine drawings of babes were much appreciated by the last generation, and she made a drawing, "Love that hath us in the net," as late as 1911 for the present Lord Tennyson, and it was full of the old charm. She also published several books on gardens.

18. John Kenworthy Bythell, Chairman of the Manchester Ship Canal Company, died at the age of 77. He was an active director of the concern from 1887, and in 1894 he became Chairman of the Directors. In the spring of 1916 Mr. Bythell retired and the shareholders marked their appreciation of his services by granting him a retiring allowance of £1000 a year.

19. Major-General Sir Frederick William Benson was born in Canada in 1849, the third son of the late Hon. J. R. Benson, of the Canadian Senate, and was educated in Toronto and at Sandhurst. At the age of 17 he served as a volunteer during the Fenian raids in Canada, and three years later he joined the 21st Hussars, then in India, afterwards serving with the 12th Lancers, the 5th Dragoon Guards and the 17th Lancers. In 1877 he was appointed A.D.C. to Sir George Couper, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, and subsequently held staff appointments in India and elsewhere. During the South African War he served as A.A.G. with the Sixth Division, receiving the C.B. and mention in dispatches. In 1903 he was appointed Inspector-General of Remounts and was afterwards Director of Transport and Remounts. He received the K.C.B. on his retirement from the Army in 1910. He was appointed to the Remount Service on the outbreak of the European War and was head of the British Remount Commission in North America.

20. Dr. Thomas Gregor Brodie, F.R.S., born in 1865, the son of the Rev. A. Brodie, was educated at King's College, London, and St. John's, Cambridge. He was an authority on physiology in London and was a lecturer or demonstrator at different times at King's College, the London Hospital, St. Thomas's, and the London School of Medicine for Women. In 1899 he was appointed Director of the Research Laboratories of the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons. In 1903 he became Professor-Superintendent of the Brown Animal Sanatory Institution of the University of London and Professor of Physiology at the Royal Veterinary College. In 1908 he became Professor of Physiology at Toronto University. Professor Brodie wrote "Essentials of Experimental Physiology."

— **Sidney Graves Hamilton** was born in 1855, the son of Maxwell Hamil-

ton, Crown Solicitor on the Irish North-Eastern Circuit. He was educated at a private school in Dublin and subsequently at Harrow, from whence he won a Balliol Scholarship at the age of 17. He was considered to be one of the most brilliant writers of Greek and Latin of his day. When he came up to Oxford, he was Hertford scholar and Latin Verse prizeman in his second term and later won the Gaisford prize for Greek Verse. He took his degree in 1878, and was then nominated with others to one of Mr. Baring's Fellowships at Hertford. He afterwards became Librarian of Hertford. Hamilton published a school edition of some books of the Odyssey, and also other works for the most part historical and antiquarian.

23. Lieutenant-Colonel H. Craigie Halkett served in the Afghan War in 1878-79 and also in the Mahsud-Waziri Expedition of 1881 and Sikkim Expedition of 1888, being mentioned in dispatches and receiving the medal with clasp.

— **Sir Richard Biddulph Martin**, the head of Martin's Bank, was born in 1828 and was educated at Harrow and Exeter College, Oxford. Sir Richard Martin was one of the founders of the Institute of Bankers, and at one time occupied its chair. He took a great interest in the affairs of the Royal Statistical Society and served as president and treasurer. Other societies in which he was interested were the Anthropological Institute and the Royal Geographical Society. He was also twice Prime Warden of the Fishmongers Company—in 1890 and 1906. He also had a guiding influence in many charitable organisations. He sat in Parliament for Tewkesbury from 1890 to 1885, and for the Droitwich Division of Worcestershire from 1892 to 1905. He was created a baronet in 1905, but there is no heir to the baronetcy.

25. William Esson was born in 1838 and was educated at the Inverness Royal Academy and at Cheltenham Grammar School, and won a scholarship at St. John's College, Oxford. He took First Classes in both the mathematical schools, and the Junior Mathematical Scholarship in 1857 and the Senior in 1860, in which year he was also elected Fellow of Merton College. Professor Esson also devoted himself to higher mathematics and its connexion with natural science, and at a comparatively early age he was

elected to a Fellowship of the Royal Society. He became Estate Bursar of Merton and a Curator of the University Chest, holding these offices till his death. In 1897 he succeeded Professor Sylvester, and on his election he ceased to be a Fellow of Merton, holding instead the Fellowship at New College, attached by statute to the Savilian Chair.

25. Henri Joseph Harpignies, the painter, was born at Valenciennes in 1819. He was educated in Paris under Achard, and afterwards studied for two years in Italy. In 1875 he was made a Chevalier of the Legion of Honour. The most important of his works was the picture "Solitude," which was exhibited at the Salon in 1897 and gained the Médaille d'Honneur. There was an exhibition of the drawings of M. Harpignies in London in March, 1910. Despite his great age he was active to the last.

28. Francis Warre-Cornish was born in 1839. His father was the Rev. H. K. Cornish, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. In 1858 F. W. Cornish was elected on to the foundation at Eton. He had a distinguished Eton career, gained the Newcastle Scholarship, and afterwards went on to King's College, Cambridge. In 1861 he took the Batta University Scholarship and was third in the First Class of the Classical Tripos; he was elected a Fellow of King's, and returned in the same year to Eton as a master. In 1868 he was appointed Vice-Provost and College Librarian and resigned his mastership, but he did not become a Fellow of Eton until his election on to the governing body at a later date. He resigned his Vice-Provostship in April, 1915, owing to ill-health. He wrote many books, the chief of which were "Sunning Well," which reflected the life of a Cathedral Clerk; and "Dr. Ashford and his Neighbours" as its sequel. He wrote too a volume of short stories, and a very comprehensive "History of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century." He contributed a good many articles to the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews.

29. George Coffey was born in 1857, the son of the late James Charles Coffey, County Court Judge, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. He was elected Keeper of Irish Antiquities in the National Museum of Ireland in 1896, which post he held for eighteen years. Mr. Coffey was

one of the first authorities on the Celtic antiquities of Ireland. His three principal works, "New Grange and other Incised Tumuli in Ireland," "The Bronze Age in Ireland," and his "Guide to the Celtic Antiquities of the Christian Period," form a complete history of ancient art in Ireland. Besides these three works he contributed many papers on art and archæology to the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, of which he was a member.

30. **Robert Walter Doyne, F.R.C.S.**, the second son of the Rev. P. W. Doyne, was born in 1857. He was educated at Marlborough and Keble College, Oxford, and after qualifying as a doctor entered the Naval Service. After leaving the Navy he devoted himself to eye work and founded the Oxford Eye Hospital. In

1902 he was appointed Reader in Ophthalmology in the University of Oxford and held this post till 1913. He was Senior Surgeon to the Royal Eye Hospital, London. His publications included "The more Common Diseases of the Eye," and "Retinal Extract in the Treatment of Atrophic 'Retinæ'."

31. **Sir John Lambert, K.C.I.E.**, was in his 78th year. He entered the Bengal Police as Deputy Superintendent in 1863 and served for 34 years. Within nine years of service he became Deputy-Commissioner of Police in Calcutta. In 1893 he was knighted, and for a time served on the Bengal Legislature; he was Commissioner of Police in Calcutta during the last eight years of his service, which terminated in 1897.

SEPTEMBER.

2. **Rev. Dr. Edward Moore**, Canon of Canterbury, was born in 1835 at Cardiff, where his father was one of the principal physicians. He was educated at Bromsgrove and Pembroke College, Oxford. In 1855 he won a first class in both Classical and Mathematical Moderations and in 1857 a first class in Lit. Hum. and a first in Mathematics, both in the same term. In 1858 he was elected Fellow of Queen's and was the first open Fellow to be elected. In 1864 he was elected to the Principalship of St. Edmund Hall and he then took a part in University affairs. He was a Mathematical Examiner in 1864, 1865, and 1870; Proctor in 1871; and a member of Council for twenty years. He was created D.Litt. at Dublin in 1892, Hon. Fellow of Pembroke in 1899, and Hon. Fellow of Queen's in 1902. In January, 1903, Moore was made a Canon of Canterbury by Mr. Balfour. To the world at large Dr. Moore's name is best known in connexion with Dante. In 1886 he was appointed Barlow Lecturer on Dante at University College, London, and was more than once reappointed. In 1894 he brought out a single volume edition of the whole works of Dante under the title of the "Oxford Dante." This admirable volume has made his name well known to Italian as well as to English scholars. In 1896 appeared the first series of his "Studies in Dante," in 1899 the second, and in 1903 the third. More than thirty years ago Dr. Moore initiated the Oxford Dante Society which has included many distinguished names. He was elected

an honorary member of the Cambridge (U.S.A.) Dante Society, a corresponding member of the Accademia della Crusca of Florence and a Fellow of the British Academy.

2. **Lieutenant-Colonel Du Paty de Clam** died as the result of ill-health following upon wounds received at the Front. He will be remembered by the part which he played in the Dreyfus affair, when he was found guilty of reprehensible conduct and retired from active service. In 1913, however, he was reinstated by the Minister of War. At the outbreak of the European War in order to avoid service in the rear, he enlisted on August 4, 1914, as a private. He was subsequently given command of the 117th Infantry, in which post he gained the Legion of Honour for distinguished conduct.

5. **Colonel Duncan F. Campbell** was born in Canada in 1876. He served in the South African Campaign, being mentioned in dispatches and receiving the D.S.O. as well as the Queen's medal with six clasps. During the European War he was twice wounded and was also mentioned in dispatches. He had been M.P. for North Ayrshire since 1911.

6. **Lady Stainer**, widow of Sir John Stainer, the noted musician, was the daughter of Mr. Thomas Randall, for some time alderman of the city of Oxford. She married in 1865. She leaves four sons and two daughters.

10. Sir James Sivewright, K.C.M.G., was born in 1848. After passing through Aberdeen University, he spent some time in the Indian Telegraph service and went to South Africa as general manager of the Telegraph system in 1877. He retired on a pension in 1885. Three years later he went into politics, being returned as member of the Cape Parliament for Griqualand East. In 1890 he joined the first Rhodes Ministry and was appointed in the same year Commissioner of Crown Lands and Public Works. The Ministry broke up in 1893 and Rhodes reconstructed his Ministry and Sivewright was no longer a member of it. He held the same office in the Sprigg Ministry which took office in 1896, and later retired from public life at the Cape and returned to England.

11. Mrs. Charles Charrington (Miss Janet Achurch) was an actress of great distinction, and her wonderful performance as Nora Helmer in the first English production of Ibsen's "A Doll's House" in 1889 established her as one of the foremost of English interpreters of Ibsen. Since 1898 her appearances on the stage were somewhat infrequent, and one of her last appearances was in a series of private performances of Mr. Eden Phillpotts's play "The Secret Woman" in 1912.

— **Dr. Albert William Schüddekopf** was born at Göttingen in 1862. In 1888 he came to England and became professor of German at Bedford College, London. Two years later he went to Yorkshire College, Leeds (now the University of Leeds), as lecturer in German, becoming professor seven years later. He was Dean of the Faculty of Arts and a member of the University Council from 1912 to 1914.

— **Dr. Vernon-Jones** was an M.D. of Dublin University (1892) and was formerly Resident Medical Officer of the Adelaide Hospital, Dublin. He was a member of the British Medical Association, and a member of the Council of the London and Counties Medical Protection Society.

— **Sir Keith George Jackson**, fourth baronet, was the second son of the second baronet, Sir Keith Alexander Jackson; and was educated at Ordinance School, Carshalton, and Magdalene College, Cambridge. In 1857 he succeeded his elder brother, who was in the Bengal Civil Service and was murdered at Lucknow during the Mutiny. Sir Keith married in 1875

and is succeeded in the title by his elder son, Robert Montresor.

13. Sir Sigmund Neumann, Bt., was born in Bavaria in 1856 and went to South Africa in his early years. He became connected with the mining industry, and his success enabled him to establish the group of mines which bears his name. He also took a considerable interest in horse-racing. He was created a baronet in 1912. He is succeeded in the title by his elder son, born in 1891.

15. Lieutenant Raymond Asquith was killed in action in France. The oldest son of the Prime Minister was born in 1878 and educated at Winchester and won an open scholarship at Balliol in 1896. He won the Ireland, Craven, and Derby Scholarships, was president of the Union Society, and in 1902 was elected a Fellow of All Souls. He was called to the Bar in 1904, and had laid the foundations of a fine practice. When the European War broke out he applied for a commission and obtained one in the Queen's Westminsters, whence he was transferred to the Grenadier Guards. He married in 1907, and leaves a son and two daughters.

— **Lieutenant-Colonel the Earl of Feversham** was killed while leading his battalion of the King's Royal Rifle Corps into action in France. Charles William Reginald Duncombe was born in 1879, the only son of William Reginald Viscount Helmsley. He was educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford. In 1902 he was appointed assistant private secretary to the First Lord of the Admiralty, a post which he held until 1905. In the following year he was elected member of Parliament for the Thirsk Division of Yorkshire, which he represented until he succeeded to the earldom on the death of his grandfather, in January, 1916. He married in 1904 Lady Marjorie Blanch Eva Craville, daughter of the Earl of Warwick, and leaves two sons and a daughter. His elder son, who was born in 1906, succeeds to the earldom.

16. The Right Hon. Thomas Andrews died in his 74th year. For fifty years he had been a prominent figure in Ulster politics and was one of the promoters of the Ulster Convention of 1892. He was for many years Chairman of the Ulster Liberal Unionist Association. Since 1905 he had been chairman of the Down County

Council and in 1912 he served the office of High Sheriff. He was appointed an Irish Privy Councillor in 1903.

16. Sir Thomas Lauder Brunton, M.D., F.R.S., was born in 1844 and was educated at Edinburgh, where he graduated M.B. in 1866, B.Sc. in 1867, M.D. in 1868, and D.Sc. in 1870; having in the meantime studied at Paris, Vienna, Berlin, and Leipzig. In 1870 he came to London and became a member of the Royal College of Physicians and a Fellow in 1876; and was appointed Assistant Physician to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, with which he had ever since been connected as physician and lecturer. In 1889 in response to an invitation from the Nizam he went to Haiderabad to conduct experiments for the elucidation of the occasionally fatal results of chloroform inhalation. On his return he published the details of his experiments and the conclusions which he founded upon them, which led to much discussion. He received many honours and distinctions, including a knighthood in 1890 and a baronetcy in 1908. He wrote many works, the most important of which are "The Textbook of Pharmacology, Materia Medica, and Therapeutics," "The Relation of Chemical Science to Physiological Action," and "Lectures on the Action of Medicines." He married in 1870, and is succeeded in the baronetcy by his eldest son, who was born in 1884.

— **Don José Echegaray** was born in Madrid about the year 1832, and received part of his education at a school in Murcia, where his father was a teacher of Greek, and entered the University of Madrid in 1847. In 1853 he took his diploma as a civil engineer, but he did not practice as an engineer. He became a teacher of mathematics, and gained a high reputation both as a teacher and as an author of several treatises on mathematics. After the revolution of 1868 he took up politics as a Liberal and held office as Minister of Finance and the Colonies. In 1873 he incurred the ill-will of the Republicans and retired to Paris. In 1880 and 1881 he reappeared in the Cortes as a Progressive Republican. On the break-up of the party, he again retired from politics, but re-entered once more in the transient Liberal Administrations of 1905 and 1906. Since 1874 Echegaray had given his attention to play-writing and wrote a long series of comedies and melodramas. A few of his dramas, "The Son of Don Juan," "Mariana," and "El Gran Galeoto," have been

translated into English. "El Gran Galeoto" was produced in 1908 by Mr. Martin Harvey under the title of "The World and his Wife."

17. Sir Cavendish Boyle, K.C.M.G., was a great-grandson of the seventh Earl of Cork, and was born in 1849. He had a long and varied career as a Government official. In 1894 Sir Cavendish Boyle became Government Secretary in British Guiana, a post which he held till 1901. In that year he was made Governor of Newfoundland, and in 1904 Governor of Mauritius, where he remained until 1911, when he retired on pension. He married in 1914, Louise, the youngest daughter of the late Mr. Reuben Sassoon, M.V.O.

— **Rev. Edward Daniel Stone** was born in 1832. He entered Eton in 1845 as King's Scholar; he won the Newcastle and became captain of the school. In 1852 he went with a scholarship to King's College, Cambridge, returning to Eton as an assistant master in 1857, where he remained until 1884. In that year he started a private school near Broadstairs, which he retained for eleven years; in 1895 he retired. Mr. Stone was ordained a deacon of the Church of England in 1860, but never entered the priesthood. He was a most distinguished classical scholar.

18. Major-General Lord Ralph Drury Kerr, K.C.B., died at the age of 79. When he was 20 years of age he joined the 10th Hussars and spent ten years in India, and served in the Afghan campaign of 1878-9, during which he commanded the 10th at the battle of Fettehabad. He was mentioned in dispatches and received the medal and a C.B. In 1883 he became Inspecting Officer of Auxiliary Cavalry in the Northern Command at York, and later he was appointed to the command of the Curragh District, which position he held until he retired in 1896.

— **Sir Hector Maclean Hay,** seventh baronet, was born in 1821. He succeeded his father in 1873, and was formerly in the firm of Mocatta and Goldsmid, bullion brokers, and for some time an officer in the London Rifle Brigade. Sir Hector was three times married, and is succeeded in the title by his nephew.

— **Seth Low** was born at Brooklyn in 1850, and was educated first in the

Polytechnic Institute of that city and later at Columbia University, where he graduated in 1870. After a tour abroad he soon became a partner in his father's tea and silk importing house. From 1882-86 he was Mayor of the City of Brooklyn, being twice elected on an independent ticket. From 1890 to 1901 he was President of Columbia College, and during his presidency the college became Columbia University. In 1900 Mr. Low was elected Mayor of Greater New York on a fusion ticket and served from 1901 to 1908. He had previously, in 1899, been a delegate to The Hague Peace Conference, in the deliberations of which he took a prominent part.

19. **Bernhard Kingrose Wise** was the second son of the late Edward Wise, Judge of the Supreme Court of New South Wales. He was born in Sydney in 1858, but was educated at Rugby, and went to Queen's, Oxford, in 1876. His career at Oxford was distinguished and he became President of the Union. Called to the Bar in England in 1883, he went in the same year to Sydney and began practice at the Bar of New South Wales. In 1898 he took silk, and eleven years before this he had become a member of the New South Wales Legislative Assembly. In politics he soon reached high office. He was Attorney-General in the Parkes Ministry from 1887-88, and held the same office in the Government of Sir William Lyne from 1889 to 1901, retaining that office and adding to it that of Minister of Justice in the See Cabinet, 1901-4. He acted as Premier of New South Wales during part of 1903 and 1904. In 1915 he accepted the post of Agent-General for New South Wales in London, a position which he held until his death.

21. **The Countess of Dunraven** was the second daughter of Lord Charles Lennox Kerr and granddaughter of the sixth Marquess of Lothian. She married Lord Dunraven in 1869.

22. **John Henry Edge, K.C.**, died in his 76th year. He was a leading authority on Irish land tenure, and published a standard work on "Forms of Leases."

23. **Sir George Franklin** was 63 years of age. He was head of the firms of Franklin, Wild & Co., of London, and Franklin, Green & Co., Sheffield. He was pro-Chancellor of Sheffield University and a former Lord

Mayor of Sheffield. He was made a knight in January, 1916.

23. **Sir Thomas Milvain, K.C.**, was 72 years of age. He was appointed Judge-Advocate-General in 1905, and was formerly Unionist member for Durham City and later for Hampstead. He was a former Recorder of Bradford.

— **George Townsend Warner** was born in 1865, a son of the Rev. G. T. Warner of Newton College, South Devon. He was educated at Harrow, and in 1888 became a scholar of Jesus College, Cambridge. He was senior in the Historical Tripos, Light-foot scholar in 1888, First Whewell scholar in International Law in 1889, and Historical Fellow of Jesus College in 1890. He became an assistant master at Harrow in 1891, master of the modern side in 1903, had a small house in 1904 and a large house in 1905. He wrote many books, chiefly for the use of schools.

24. **W. E. Denison** died at the age of 78. He was educated at Eton and was at one time in the Royal Artillery. He was M.P. for Nottingham from 1874 to 1880, and was a familiar figure in the cricketing field.

— **George Devereux de Vere Capell**, seventh Earl of Essex, was born in 1857, and succeeded his grandfather in the title in 1892. At the age of 20 he received a commission in the Grenadier Guards. Later he joined the Herts Yeomanry, succeeding Lord Clarendon as Commanding Officer. He saw service in South Africa (1900-1) in command of a brigade of Yeomanry with the rank of Brigadier-General. In Hertfordshire he was Vice Lieutenant and Vice-Chairman of the County Territorial Force Association. He was married twice, and is succeeded by the eldest son of his first marriage, Viscount Malden, born in 1884.

— **Bedford McNeill** graduated at the Royal School of Mines in 1880 and was consulting engineer to numerous enterprises. He was the compiler of the topographic code, issued originally in 1898 and enlarged and revised in 1908, which is employed by mining companies and engineers.

— **Chief Detective-Inspector Alfred Ward**, of the Criminal Investigation Department, Scotland Yard, had served in the Metropolitan Police Force for over twenty-seven years. He dealt with many famous

cases, and his last big public case was that of Lincoln, the ex-M.P. He was probably the greatest expert possessed by the force in forgery cases.

26. Sir Thomas Rees Price, K.C.M.G., was 68 years of age. After having held various positions on the Vale of Neath and Great Western Railways he obtained an appointment on the Cape Government railways forty years ago, and held in turn the positions of traffic, goods, and general manager. He was a Commissioner of Railways and Harbours of the Union of South Africa on the establishment of the Union in 1910, Railway Commissioner, South African Railways, Johannesburg, since 1902, and a Public Debt Commissioner for the Union.

28. Sir Charles Cayzer was born in 1848. He was the founder of the firm of Cayzer, Irvine & Co. Ltd., and chairman of the Clan Line. In 1892 Sir Charles entered Parliament as the first Conservative member for Barrow-in-Furness and represented the constituency until 1906. Four years later he unsuccessfully contested the Monmouth District in the Conservative interest. He was knighted in 1897 and in 1904 was created a baronet. Sir Charles was a generous contributor to philanthropic objects. He married in 1868 and had issue six sons and three daughters. One of his daughters married Sir John Jellicoe, and another

Sir John Jellicoe's Chief-of Staff, Rear-Admiral Madden.

29. Colonel Vaughan Wynn Phillips, R.A., died suddenly at the age of 61. He served in Afghanistan, and when the European War broke out he raised a battery of horse artillery and brought it to efficiency in eight months. He was an authority on range finding and optical instruments.

30. The Rev. Lord Blythswood, Sholto Douglas Campbell, second baron, was born in 1889. He succeeded his brother in the barony in 1908. He was educated at Cheam School and graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1864. In 1865 he was ordained by Dr. Philpott, Bishop of Worcester, to the curacy of Nuneston. He subsequently held many livings chiefly in large and poor districts. He was a devoted Protestant, and his Protestantism was at all times uncompromising; his chief missionary interest was naturally the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. He wrote little, and his only published works were "Order of Events in our Lord's Second Coming" and "The Anti-Christ." In 1889 he married Miss Violet Paget, daughter of the late Lord Alfred Paget. He had no children, and the barony passes to his brother, Major-General Sir Barrington Bulkeley Douglas Campbell-Douglas, born in 1845.

OCTOBER.

1. Sir William Theodore Doxford, the chairman of the Wear Ship-building firm of William Doxford and Sons, Ltd., died in his 75th year. His firm is now one of the largest ship-building companies in the country, and has built largely for the Clan Line of steamers. He was Unionist M.P. for Sunderland from 1895 to 1906 and was knighted in 1900.

2. Benjamin Kidd was born in 1858. He is known as the author of a series of books and articles dealing with a system of social philosophy. In pursuit of his economic studies he travelled extensively in the United States and Canada in 1898, and in South Africa in 1902. In 1904 he published his work on "Social Evolution," and it has been translated into German, Swedish, French, Russian, Italian, Chinese, Czech, Danish, and Arabic. Another of the best known of Mr. Kidd's works was the "Principles of Western

Civilisation," which was published in 1902. He contributed a prefatory article to the tenth edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" on "The Application of the Doctrine of Evolution to Sociological Theory," and for the eleventh edition he wrote the article on sociology. He delivered the Herbert Spencer lecture at Oxford in 1908, the subject being "Individualism and After." Mr. Kidd has left in MS. a work which he had completed before the outbreak of the European War, but since that time he had re-written the work.

2. Lord Rollo was born in 1835, and succeeded his father, the ninth baron, in 1852. He greatly extended the family estates and built a mansion at Duncrub, near the site of the old castle, which was begun in 1851 and finished in 1863. He also improved the Dunning district considerably; in 1858 he built a new Town Hall and

afterwards he erected some water-works. He married in 1857, Agnes Bruce, the eldest daughter of the late Colonel Trotter, and is succeeded by his son, the Master of Rollo.

3. **Ernest Laurence Levett, K.C.**, was born in 1846 and educated at Cheltenham College. In 1865 he passed for Woolwich, but entered St. John's College, Cambridge, and took his degree in the Mathematical Tripos of 1870 as third Wrangler. He was elected a Fellow of St. John's in 1870 and was an assistant master at Repton for a short time. As a law student he read in the chambers of Mr. (afterwards Lord Justice) Romer. He was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1873, and he came to be recognised as one of the best lawyers and advocates who have practised at the Chancery Bar during recent years. He retired from practice at the end of 1913.

— **Sir James Drumgole Linton** was born in 1841. Soon after his training as an art student he began to exhibit works both in water-colour and in oils. His talent lay in the direction of figure and costume painting. In 1884 he was elected President of the Institute of Painters in Water-Colours (afterwards "Royal"). He was knighted in 1885; he held the presidency till 1899 and again from 1909 till his death, and was honorary member of many other societies, British and foreign.

— **Richard Phéné Spiers, F.R.I.B.A., F.S.A.**, was born in 1838. He was a past president of the Architectural Association, a Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, Associate and Fellow of King's College, London; Honorary and Corresponding Member of the Société Centrale des Architectes, Paris; Sociedad de los Arquitectos, Madrid; and an Hon. Associate of the American Institute of Architects. He edited Ferguson's "History of Architecture" in 1893 and had written much on architectural subjects.

4. **Sir Richard Davis Awdry, K.C.B.**, was born in 1843 and educated at Marlborough. He entered the Admiralty in 1861, and in the earlier part of his service he was private secretary to members of several Admiralty administrations. In 1885 he became the Assistant Secretary of the Admiralty and in 1896 was appointed to the responsible office of Accountant-General of the Navy. He retired from the

service in May, 1904, and for the past twelve years he served as director of more than one important business undertaking. He married twice, and leaves three children, his heir, Richard Trevor Worthington Awdry, having been born in 1904.

4. **Dr. James Burgess, C.I.E., A.R.I.B.A.**, was 84 years of age. He went out to India as an architect before the Mutiny and subsequently did educational work, first in Calcutta and then in Bombay, where he was secretary of the local geographical society. In 1872 he founded the "Indian Antiquary," which he conducted for twelve years. In 1874 he was appointed Archaeological Surveyor for Western India and a few years later for Southern India as well. From 1886-89 he was Director-General of the Archaeological Survey of India. He retired in 1889.

6. **Alfred Paget Humphry, M.V.O.**, was the only son of the late Professor Sir George Humphry, F.R.S. He was educated at Rugby and at Trinity College, Cambridge, and afterwards called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn. He was known to Cambridge men as Senior Esquire Badell, a post which he held for thirty-six years. He was a brilliant shot and was a member of the Council of the National Rifle Association and of the Cambridge Territorial Forces Association from 1886-89. For a time, Mr. Humphry was Bursar of Selwyn College and Steward of Trinity College.

9. **Horace Henry Hart** was born in 1840. He was for many years Controller of the Oxford University Press, which post he held from 1888 to March, 1915, when he retired on account of ill-health. His command of the literature of his trade is shown in a handsome volume compiled by him entitled "A Century of Oxford Typography," printed at the University Press in 1900. In 1897 Mr. Hart was given the degree of M.A. *honoris causa* by the University.

— **Admiral Sir William Robert Kennedy, G.C.B.**, was born in 1834, son of Mr. John Kennedy, Chargé d'Affaires at Naples, and entered the Navy in 1851. In 1856 he went out to China in the *Calcutta*, flagship of Sir Michael Seymour. In 1857 he was promoted to Lieutenant and was engaged in all the operations of that war, including the capture of Canton and of the Taku forts. He returned to England in the autumn of 1859. He was promoted to Commander in 1867, and

commanded the *Vestal* on the North American station and the *Reindeer* in the Pacific from 1871-74. For his services on the coasts of Peru and Mexico during this disturbed time, he was rewarded by promotion to Captain in 1874. In 1887 he was awarded a Captain's good service pension, and in 1889 attained the rank of Rear-Admiral. From 1892-95 he was Commander-in-Chief in the East Indies, becoming a Vice-Admiral in the following year. He received the K.C.B. at Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee. In 1900 he was appointed Commander-in-Chief at the Nore, a post which he held until shortly after his promotion to Admiral in June, 1901. He retired in November, 1901. He published many books, but the best known and most popular was "Hurrah for the Life of a Sailor," which came out in 1901.

9. Brigadier-General Philip Howell, C.M.G., who was born in 1877, was the son of the late Lieutenant-Colonel Horace Howell. He entered the Indian Army in Queen's Own Corps of Guides in 1897, and was promoted Captain in 1906. In 1918 he was gazetted Major in the 4th Hussars, and became Lieutenant-Colonel in the following year. He held several Staff appointments in India, and from 1909-11 was a General Staff Officer at the War Office. In 1915 he was appointed Brigadier-General, General Staff. He saw active service on the North-West Frontier of India in 1908 (medal and clasp) and in 1915 was appointed C.M.G. for his services in the European War. He was killed in action in France.

18. Otto William Luitpold Adalbert Woldemar, King of Bavaria from 1886 to November, 1913, was born at Munich in 1848. He became King on the death from drowning of his brother Ludwig II., but more than ten years earlier he had been declared an incurable lunatic and had been confined first in the Nymphenburg Castle, near Munich, then at Schleissheim, and finally at Fürstenried Castle, where he died. His uncle Prince Luitpold became Regent, and during the whole of this long Regency no attempt was made to depose King Otto, but at the death of the Prince in 1912 it was decided to depose the mad king, and within a year his cousin ascended the throne as Ludwig III.

— **Nicola Filipescu**, who was descended from an old family of Rumanian *boyars*, was born in 1857.

He studied law in Paris, and after his return to Rumania was elected deputy. In July, 1900, he was appointed Minister of Agriculture and Domains. From January, 1911, to April, 1912, he was Minister of War, and his period of office was signalised by the reorganisation of the Army. He afterwards retired from the Ministry of War, again became Minister of Agriculture and continued to hold office till March, 1913. M. Filipescu was known throughout Europe as one of the most prominent leaders of the Rumanian movement for intervention in the European War and M. Take Jonescu's chief helper in his efforts to secure Rumanian support for the Allies.

14. William Benjamin Oldham, C.I.E., served thirty-five years in the Indian Civil Service, and when he retired in 1900 was the senior member of the Bengal Board of Revenue and a member of the Bengal Legislative Council. During the Lushai Hills campaign of 1892 he was Inspector-General of Military Police, and he received the C.I.E. in the following year in recognition of his work in the pacification of the Lushai country.

16. James Peter Gilhooly, M.P., was born in 1847. He had represented the West Cork Division as a Nationalist since 1885. He was prominently identified with the land campaign and was several times imprisoned.

— **The Hon. Mary Elizabeth Lady Ponsonby** was the widow of General Sir Henry Ponsonby, who was for a long time Queen Victoria's private secretary. She was the eldest daughter of Mr. J. C. Bulleol of Flete, and granddaughter of the second Earl Grey; she was appointed Maid-of-Honour to Queen Victoria and she married Sir Henry Ponsonby in 1861. After his death in 1895 she was appointed an extra Woman of the Bedchamber.

18. William Heseltine Mudford, formerly editor and manager of the *Standard*, was born in 1839. His father was the proprietor of the *Kentish Observer* and *Canterbury Journal*. He came to London and became a contributor to the *Standard*, and on the death of the proprietor in the early seventies he was left absolute master as editor and conductor of the journal. From that time he cultivated the habit of seclusion both in private life and in the conduct of the paper; he never went into society and

only the principal members of his staff ever saw him. He was an excellent judge of men and he contrived to surround himself with a highly efficient staff. The *Standard* during his editorship was a real power in the land and represented the views of the propertied and mercantile classes. In 1900 he made over the editorship to the late G. B. Curtis, who had long acted as his representative in Shoe Lane. After Mr. Mudford's retirement from the editorship of the paper a rapid decline in its prosperity set in.

20. Sir Henry Benbow, K.C.B., D.S.O., born in 1838, entered the Navy as Assistant Engineer in 1861 and became Chief Engineer in 1879. He served with the Naval Brigade landed for the relief of General Gordon at Khartum in 1884-5, and was mentioned in dispatches and promoted to Inspector of Machinery for his gallantry in repairing the boiler of the *Sofia* under heavy fire during Lord Beresford's expedition for the relief of Sir Charles Wilson. He became Chief Inspector in 1888; received the D.S.O. three years later; and was made a K.C.B. in 1902. He retired from the Navy in 1893.

21. Count Stürgkh, the Austrian Prime Minister, was shot in Vienna by Dr. Friedrich Adler, the socialist, son of the well-known founder of the Austrian Socialist Party. Count Stürgkh entered the Austrian Parliament some thirty years ago as a nominee of the big landlords. He first acquired influence by his support of the Körber Administration (1900-4), during which period he acted as the Premier's chief parliamentary lieutenant. During this period he made the acquaintance of a person named Singer, son of a provincial rabbi, who had risen to be head of the Press Bureau and controlled the secret Press funds. In 1910 through Singer's influence Count Stürgkh secured the appointment of Minister of Public Instruction, and on the fall of the new Gautsch Cabinet on October 31, 1911, he became Premier. This position he continued to hold until the day of his murder, in spite of many vicissitudes, which included a long period of almost total blindness.

22. Sir Maurice Fitzgerald, second baronet and 20th Knight of Kerry, was the eldest son of the first baronet, born in 1844. He was educated at Harrow. He joined the Rifle Brigade and served in the Ashanti

War as A.D.C. to Sir Archibald Alison, being mentioned in dispatches. He retired from the Army in 1881 with the rank of Captain. He had acted as Equerry to the Duke of Connaught. Sir Maurice succeeded to the baronetcy in 1880, his father having died just after its creation. He married in 1882, Amelia, daughter of the late Mr. H. L. Bischoffsheim, and leaves two sons and a daughter. He is succeeded by his elder son, who was born in 1884.

23. Sir Joseph Beecham was the son of Thomas Beecham, who founded the great pill-making business at St. Helens, Lancashire. He was born in 1848 and entered the business at an early age. In 1899 he accepted the office of Mayor of St. Helens, and during his mayoralty he encouraged all kinds of musical entertainment, at which his son acted as conductor. He afterwards financed various schemes for popularising opera in England, some of his productions being at the Aldwych Theatre, of which he became proprietor. He was knighted in 1912 and was created a baronet in June, 1914. In 1913 he had a five weeks' season of Russian opera and ballet at Drury Lane which at once became a marked success. He was made by the Tsar a Knight of the Order of St. Stanislaus for his services to Russian opera and ballet. He is succeeded in the title by his son, Sir Thomas Beecham, who was born in 1879, and knighted in the 1916 New Year Honours.

24. Sir Jacob Elias Sassoon was the grandson of David Sassoon who early in the last century migrated to Bombay and founded a vast business. Sir Jacob represented his father's firm of general merchants and bankers in China, and on the death of his father in 1880 established branches in London and Manchester. He played a prominent part in developing the cotton textile industry of Western India. He also originated the idea of establishing the Eastern Bank, with headquarters in London. Sir Jacob received his baronetcy in 1909 and was generally recognised as head of the Jewish community in India. He married but leaves no children, and the baronetcy passes by special remainder to his younger brother and partner, Mr. Edward Elias Sassoon.

25. Charles Samuel Jackson was born in 1868. He was head boy at Bedford, a scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, and eighth Wrangler in 1889. He obtained a First Class in

Part II. of the Law Tripos in 1890 and was called to the Bar in the following year. In 1891 he became instructor in mathematics at the Military Academy at Woolwich and held the post up to the day of his death.

25. **Sir John William Pitt Muir-Mackenzie, K.C.S.I.**, was born in 1854, the sixth son of the second baronet. He was educated at Eton and passed into the Indian Civil Service in 1874. He became Under-Secretary to the Government of India in the Revenue and Agricultural Departments, and subsequently Director of Agriculture. He was a member of the Executive Council of the Government of Bombay from 1905 to 1910, when he retired, and in 1907 acted temporarily as Governor.

27. **George Elliott, K.C.**, was born in 1860, and after receiving his education at Mill Hill School he read for the Bar. He was called by the Inner Temple in 1882, and when he was little more than 21 years of age he entered the chambers of Sir Edward Clarke. His practice grew quickly and he soon gained a reputation for his knowledge of the Licensing Act and practice, and of Criminal law. At the Old Bailey he leaves a long and conspicuous record, and he held briefs in a large number of cases which attracted widespread public interest. Mr. Elliott took silk in 1909. He stood twice as Unionist candidate for South Bedfordshire, without success.

28. **Charles A. Harrison**, lately Engineer-in-Chief of the North-Eastern Railway, was born in India in 1848. He was educated at Marlborough College. He was responsible for the designs of a number of famous viaducts,

among them the King Edward Bridge over the Tyne at Newcastle opened by the King in 1906, and the Alexandra Bridge over the Weir at Sunderland. He retired in 1915, but was consulting engineer to the company till his death.

29. **General Sir Frederick Richard Maunsell, K.C.B., R.E.**, Colonel Commandant of King George's Own Sappers and Miners, died in his 89th year. He served in the Punjab Campaign of 1848-9. In the Mutiny he was twice wounded and took part in numerous other engagements, being five times mentioned in dispatches. He was again mentioned in dispatches for his services in the Afghan War of 1878-79. He received the K.C.B. in 1897.

31. **Major Lord Llangattock** died of wounds received while serving with the R.F.A. in France. John Maclean Rollo, the eldest son of the first baron, was born in 1870. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, graduating B.A. in 1893 and taking his M.A. and B.C.L. in 1896. He was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in the same year. In January, 1916, he joined the R.F.A. and had not been long on active service. In 1900 he was High Sheriff of Monmouth and Mayor of Monmouth in 1906-7. He was also a J.P. and D.L. and a county councillor for Monmouthshire. Lord Llangattock, who succeeded his father, the first baron, in 1912 was unmarried, and there being no heir to the barony the title becomes extinct. Lady Llangattock had two other sons, the Hon. Henry Allen Rollo, who died June, 1915, and the Hon. Charles Stewart Rollo, the pioneer motorist and airman who was killed while flying in 1910.

NOVEMBER.

2. **Professor John Ferguson** was educated at Glasgow High School and University, and in 1868 became assistant to the Professor of Chemistry, whom he succeeded six years later. He retired from the Chair of Chemistry quite recently. He was a well-known archæologist and a Fellow of the British Archæological Society. He was an honorary LL.D. of St. Andrews.

3. **Lady Ellenborough** was the daughter of the late Mr. John Harvey Astell, of Woodbury Hall, Sandy, Bedfordshire, and married in 1884 the sixth Lord Ellenborough, who succeeded his

brother in the peerage in December, 1915.

3. **Professor H. H. W. Pearson** was Professor of Botany in the South African College. He had a European reputation, which his discovery of missing links in evolutionary botany established for him.

— **Rev. William Thwaites** was born in 1824. He had been Vicar of Whittington, Norfolk, for the past 41 years. He was formerly a school-master in the convict ships, in the

abolition of which he claimed to have had a considerable share.

4. **The Marquis de Breteuil** was born in 1848, a member of a typical noble French family. He will be remembered by Englishmen as the lifelong friend of King Edward; and in 1912 King George chose him as the fittest Frenchman to introduce the Prince of Wales to French Society and national life. The Marquis was made a Knight Commander of the Victorian Order in 1905, and he received the Grand Cross of the Order from King George in 1912.

— **Lord Clanmorris** died at the age of 64 years. He succeeded to the barony in 1876. He was A.D.C. to the late Duke of Marlborough when Viceroy of Ireland from 1876 to 1878. He married in 1878 the only child and heiress of Robert Edward Ward, of Bangor Castle, by whom he had six sons and three daughters, all of whom survive him. He is succeeded in the title by his eldest son, the Hon. Arthur Bingham.

5. **Cardinal Della Voipe** was born at Ravenna in 1844, and elevated to the Cardinalate in 1899. He held office at the Vatican, being Prefect of the Index and Carmerlengo of the Holy Roman Church. Cardinal Della Voipe was appointed to the latter office in 1914.

— **Frank Hugh O'Donnell** was among the best known of the members of the Irish Parliamentary Party during its most active period in the late seventies and early eighties. He was born in 1848, and he had not long left Queen's College, Galway, when at the age of 26 he was elected for Galway City as a Home Ruler under the leadership of Isaac Butt. At the General Election of 1880 he was returned for Dungarvan as a follower of Parnell; but disliking the policy and methods of the Land League he gradually broke off relations with the Irish Party; and with the disappearance of his constituency in the Redistribution Scheme of 1885 he dropped out of Irish public life.

6. **Mrs. Dion Boucicault**, the wife of the famous Irish playwright and actor, was born in 1838. She went on the stage at the age of 10 years, and at 16 she joined Charles Kean's Company at the Princess's Theatre in London. Her "sweet looks and sweet voice" drew praise from G. H. Lewes. She was the original player of all the

heroines in her husband's most famous plays, and was much admired both in America and the United Kingdom. After her husband's death in 1890 her appearances on the stage were very few.

6. **Canon Horace Evelyn Clayton**, the fifth son of the Rev. J. H. Clayton, Rector of Farnborough, was born in 1853. He was educated at Marlborough Grammar School, from which he obtained a Somerset scholarship at Brasenose in 1871. Ordained in 1876 to the curacy of St. Mary Magdalen with St. George the Martyr, Oxford, he became vicar in 1884, and held the benefice until his death. In 1879 he became Chaplain of Magdalen, and Fellows' Chaplain some years later, and also acted as Chaplain of New College from 1875 to 1885. At Magdalen he was, further, Divinity Lecturer from 1884 to 1893. In 1896 he was appointed Rural Dean of Oxford. He was made an Honorary Canon of Christ Church in 1903.

12. **Rear-Admiral the Hon. Thomas Brand**, the second son of Mr. Speaker Brand, afterwards first Viscount Hampden, was born in 1847. Entering the Royal Navy in 1861, he became a lieutenant in 1870, and from 1874 to 1877 served as flag-lieutenant to the late Admiral Lord Alcester, then in command of the Channel Squadron. At the bombardment of Alexandria in 1882 Brand was in command of the *Bittern*. He was mentioned in dispatches, and was awarded the Egyptian medal with clasp for Alexandria, and the Khedive's bronze star, and promoted to captain. In 1892 he retired as a captain and was advanced to the rank of rear-admiral in 1898. Admiral Brand was a J.P. for the county of Sussex and an Alderman of the County Council. He contested four Parliamentary elections as a Liberal for Hastings in 1886 and for the Eastbourne Division of Sussex in 1892, 1895, and 1900.

— **Hon. Henry John Coke** was the last surviving child of the famous "Coke of Norfolk," afterwards Earl of Leicester, with Lady Annalia Koppel, the daughter of the fourth Earl of Albemarle. He died aged 89 years. In 1889 he entered the Navy and saw service in the Chinese War of 1840-41, but left the Navy in 1842 immediately after his father's death. He spent a few terms at Cambridge, but in 1848 he went to the Continent and was present in Vienna during the revolutionary

trouble. In 1852 he returned home from his travels and contested Crickdale as a Radical, but he did not go to the poll. From 1855 to 1857 he was private secretary to Mr. Horsman, then Irish Secretary in Lord Palmerston's Government, but after Horsman's quarrel with Palmerston, Mr. Coke withdrew from politics. His book "Tracks of a Rolling Stone" gives a graphic and living story of his life and the notabilities of the nineteenth century whom he met from Lady Holland and the Marquess of Anglesey to Huxley and Ellen Terry.

12. Alderman Sir Walter Vaughan Morgan was the sixth of the ten children of Mr. Thomas Morgan of Pipton, Glasbury, Brecon. At the age of 9 he was sent to Christ's Hospital. On leaving Christ's Hospital in his 15th year, he obtained an appointment in the National Provincial Bank of England, and by the age of 20 was a chief cashier in their Manchester branch. In 1855 he left the bank to join five of his brothers in business in the City of London. They founded the Morgan Crucible Works at Battersea and established two trade journals, the *Ironmonger* and the *Chemist and Druggist*. Sir Walter's municipal career began in 1892, when he was unanimously elected Alderman of Cordwainer Ward. In 1900-1 he served the office of Sheriff in the mayoralty of the late Sir Frank Green. In 1905 he was chosen as Lord Mayor. At the close of his mayoralty he was created a baronet, and he also received the insignia of high grades in the Legion of Honour and other foreign Orders.

— **George Alexander Redford** became Licensor of Plays in 1875. Later, he was appointed assistant and deputy to Mr. Pigott, Examiner of Plays, and he succeeded to that office in 1895 and held it until 1911. Of recent years he has held the unofficial post of Censor of Films, which was set up by the film manufacturers.

13. Charles Smith was born in 1844. Educated at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, he was Third Wrangler in 1868. In the same year he was elected a Fellow of his College and five years later Tutor. In 1890 he succeeded the late Dr. Phelps as Master of Sidney. From 1896 to 1909 he represented the University on the governing body of Eton College. He was the author of numerous popular elementary treatises on various branches of mathematics, all of which met with considerable success.

14. Rev. Henry Melvill Gwatkin, D.D., was educated at Shrewsbury in the later days of Dr. Kennedy's famous rule; he went up with a scholarship to St. John's, Cambridge, where his father, the Rev. R. G. Gwatkin, had been tutor. In 1868 he was placed alone on the Theological Examinations (afterwards called Tripos) for Middle Bachelors, taking the Hebrew prize and the Scholefield prize for Biblical Greek. He had won the Carus Greek Testament prize as an undergraduate in 1865, and won it again as a bachelor in 1869. He was elected to a Fellowship at St. John's in 1868, and when he vacated this in 1874 the College made him Theological Lecturer. His powers as a teacher were almost unique, and in 1891 he succeeded Creighton as Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge and the attached Fellowship at Emmanuel. The new professor was ordained at Auckland by Bishop Westcott. In 1903 he was appointed to give the Gifford Lectures at Edinburgh. His most important published works were "Studies in Arianism"; "The Knowledge of God," published in 1906; and "Early Church History to A.D. 313," published in 1909.

— **Brigadier-General Charles Henry Kennedy, C.B., R.M.L.I.**, had served thirty-six years in the corps.

— **General Sir Horace Montagu** was the son of the late Rev. George Montagu and was born in 1823. Educated at Shrewsbury, he joined the Royal Engineers in 1842, and on the outbreak of the war with Russia proceeded to the Crimea, and was present at the battles of Alma and Inkerman. He was six times mentioned in dispatches, and as a reward for his services he received the brevet ranks of major and lieutenant-colonel, the Crimean medal with three clasps, and other distinctions. In 1887 he was appointed Colonel Commandant of the Royal Engineers. He received the K.C.B. in 1905.

— **Sir James Dods Shaw** represented the Press Association in the Parliamentary Lobbies for many years, and in 1908 he was appointed to manage the newly-formed House of Commons reporting staff and edit the "Debates," then for the first time published under the direct authority of the House. He was knighted in 1918.

— **M. Denis Stefanou**, a former Minister for Foreign Affairs and Secretary to the late King George of the Hel-

lenes, came of an old and esteemed Zante family. He began his career at the Bar. After the war of 1897 he went as Minister to Constantinople, where he exhibited considerable diplomatic ability. Later he was appointed Chief of King George's Civil Cabinet, a post which he held until 1910 when he retired from public life.

14. **Henryk Sienkiewicz**, the Polish novelist, was born in 1848 and began to write in 1872. He afterwards became the editor of the Warsaw paper *Słowo*, and in its columns he published as a serial the trilogy of historical romances which made him famous. The three books composing the trilogy are entitled, "With Fire and Sword," "The Deluge," and "Pan Michael." Mr. Jeremiah Curtin translated this tremendous work of about twenty volumes into English. The work by which Sienkiewicz is best known in England is "Quo Vadis?"

15. **Charles Dunell Rudd** was born in 1844. He was educated at Harrow and Cambridge. In 1893 Rudd was sent to the Cape for his health and was there brought into touch at Kimberley with Cecil Rhodes. The two became partners. In 1880 the De Beers Mining Company was formed, of which he became a director. He was a member of the Cape Parliament from 1883 to 1888 and was one of the founders of the Gold Fields Company of South Africa. In 1888 he was one of the three men who went to Matabeleland and obtained from Lobengula the concession which is the title of the British South Africa Company in Rhodesia.

— **Herr Von Tschirschky und Bögendorff** was the German Ambassador to the Austro-Hungarian Court when the European War broke out. He entered the German Diplomatic Service in 1884, at the age of 28. For 17 years he held several minor appointments, but in 1894 he was selected to be Secretary of Embassy at St. Petersburg. He remained there for five years. In 1900-1 he represented Germany at Luxemburg and subsequently, until his appointment to be German Foreign Secretary in 1906, he was Prussian Envoy at Hamburg. While at Hamburg he attracted the notice of the Emperor William, and later he was chosen to succeed Baron von Richthofen at the Wilhelmstrasse, but was scarcely a success there, and in 1907 he was appointed to succeed Prince (then Count) Wedel as German Ambassador in Vienna. Austro-Hun-

garian foreign policy hereafter took its inspiration increasingly from the Ambassadorial palace in the Metternichgasse. Tschirschky worked hand in hand with the military party, and was the guiding spirit of all the scandals and provocative tactics employed by the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office against Serbia and Montenegro in the winter of 1912-13. Precisely what part Tschirschky played in and after the Serajevo assassinations may never be known, but it is certain that while the Allied Governments were working for peace at Vienna, he did nothing to second their efforts.

18. **The Rev. Thomas Given-Wilson** died aged 81. A graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, he was ordained in 1878 and was appointed in 1884 to the vicarage of St. Mary's, Plais-tow, which he held for 30 years. He did remarkable social work in this poor East-end parish, which was concentrated in the Given-Wilson Institute.

20. **Lieutenant-General Benjamin Lumsden Gordon, K.C.B.**, the son of Captain James Gordon, was born in 1833. He joined the Madras Artillery in 1852, served through the Mutiny, and was present at the relief of Lucknow and the battle of Cawnpore. He was Lord Roberts' artillery commander in the advance on Kabul, and for his services was mentioned in dispatches and appointed a C.B. In the 1886-87 expedition he was appointed as Major-General to command in Lower Burma; and at the time of the Chin Lushai expedition, two years later, assumed the whole Burmese command, doing distinguished service for which he was mentioned in dispatches and thanked three times by the Viceroy of India. He retired in 1891, and was created K.C.B. in 1899.

21. **The Emperor Francis Joseph** was born on August 18, 1830, and was the oldest Sovereign in Europe. The greatest influence during the early part of Francis Joseph's life was that of his mother, who was a woman of strong, clear mind, and up to 1848 of comparatively liberal tendency. She voluntarily renounced the throne for herself and her vacillating husband, and desired that her son as soon as possible after attaining his majority (Aug. 18, 1848) should wear his uncle's Crown. Though the revolution of 1848 deranged her plans, her influence was decisive in securing Ferdinand's abdication and the accession of Francis Joseph on December 2, 1848.

She died in 1854. In March, 1849, an Imperial charter incorporated Hungary with Austria. Kossuth replied by issuing the Declaration of Debreczen which banished the Hapsburgs from the Kingdom. The outcome of this struggle, with the repressive measures which Francis Joseph employed, embittered Hungarian feeling and sullied the opening of his reign. Probably no event of his long reign, save the outbreak of the European War, made upon Francis Joseph a deeper impression than the help given by Russia in crushing the Hungarian insurrection of 1848-49. And in spite of his "world-astonishing ingratitude" in allying himself with the Western Powers against Russia at the moment of the Crimean War, he had always a great feeling of veneration for the memory of Nicholas I. Although the threads of foreign policy were in his own hands he could not be made entirely responsible for Austrian failure to render Russia service for service. Francis Joseph never thought out his foreign policy, and was guided by utilising the balance of conflicting ideas and tendencies; he had a temperamental dislike of firm decisions and clear situations. Such an attitude of mind placed him at the mercy of opponents like Cavour and Bismarck, who had clear plans and were resolved to execute them. He suffered in 1854 and again in the same way in 1859. In 1859 and during the early sixties Venetia might have been the price, if not of an Italian alliance, at least of Italian neutrality in the inevitable Austro-Prussian struggle. Partly by disposition and partly as a precaution Francis Joseph was never quite frank with his advisers. They were Ministers of his will, but were not admitted fully into his confidence. He would suffer no Minister long to overshadow the Crown, and many a Minister, politician, or statesman could attribute his fall to the Monarch's resentment of his popularity. He constantly sought advice and information from men of different schools, and this frequently led him to the conception of two or more alternative policies which resulted in ambiguity, and sometimes when circumstances pressed, impatience would overcome him and a premature decision would be adopted. Such a decision was his untimely resolve to make war on the Sardinian Kingdom and France in 1859; and such also may well have been his assent to the Ultimatum to Serbia of July 23, 1914. The Austro-Prussian War of 1866 marked the turning-point in his political develop-

ment. The Austrian object was to settle things at home so as to secure Hungarian support for Austria's foreign policy, but the Magyar leaders were too shrewd to lend themselves to these plans and the Emperor drifted into the struggle with Prussia without Hungarian support. Only when Austria had been crushed at Sadowa did she turn towards Hungary in search of a new centre of strength. The Emperor had however to content himself with the maintenance of a Joint Austro-Hungarian Army and Diplomatic Service. The Dual System made Hungary for nearly 50 years the real pivot of the Monarchy. These days following Sadowa were perhaps the saddest moments of Francis Joseph's life. The Austro-German Alliance was concluded in 1879. In 1882 the Triple Alliance was created by the extension of the Austro-German Alliance to Italy. Under the Alliance Austro-Hungarian foreign policy became largely subservient to that of Germany. But while Francis Joseph was leaving to his ally the lead in foreign affairs his influence at home increased from year to year. Internal issues, however, were overshadowed during his last years by the great international crisis arising out of the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and out of the Balkan Wars of 1912-13. He rejoiced at the final incorporation of Bosnia and the Herzegovina in his dominions, and regarded them as a sort of compensation for the loss of Lombardy and Venetia. The errors of diplomatic method committed by Count Aehrenthal during the annexation crises tended to estrange the Courts of Vienna and St. Petersburg. These relations became so strained that at last the Emperor Francis Joseph dispatched Prince Gottfried Hohenlohe to St. Petersburg on a mission of peace. The mission failed. In the second Balkan War Austrian prestige suffered still further from the downfall of Bulgaria, who had been largely a victim of Austro-Hungarian policy. Partly in the hope of restoring this prestige, and partly under the influence of German military designs, Austria adopted an aggressive diplomatic policy in the Balkans. In July, 1914, after the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand at Sarajevo in mysterious circumstances she presented to Serbia the Ultimatum that precipitated the Great War. The direct responsibility of Francis Joseph for this policy cannot be ascertained. But through this last great decision his reign has closed amid ruin, bankruptcy, blood and tears, which might otherwise

have been a great era in Hapsburg history. His private life was filled with every sorrow and humiliation that can fall to the lot of any one man; he saw his brother, wife, son, and nephew perish by violence. The Emperor Francis Joseph married in 1854 Elizabeth, Duchess of Bavaria, by whom he had one son and two daughters. The new Emperor is the nephew of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand.

21. Sir John Samuel Moore, K.C.B., was born in 1831. He entered the Navy in 1846 and served in the Cape Station during the Kafir war in 1849-52. He took part in the naval operations of the Crimean campaign. During the Egyptian war of 1882 he was secretary to the Commander-in-Chief, Mediterranean Station, was present at the bombardment of Alexandria, and was mentioned in dispatches. From 1883 to 1891, when he retired, he was Fleet Paymaster on board the Royal Yacht *Victoria and Albert*.

— **Eugène-Louis Doyen**, the famous French surgeon, was born in 1859, at Reims. His work on cancer earned him a wide celebrity, but his theory failed.

22. Lieutenant-Colonel Sir David William Keith Barr, K.C.S.I., was born in 1846, the son of the late Lieutenant-General H. J. Barr. He studied at Sandhurst, and was admitted an ensign of the 44th Regiment in 1864. In 1866 he entered the Indian Political Service as Political Assistant in Central India. In 1887 he was selected for the agency at Gwalior and six years later he went to Kashmir as Resident, afterwards returning to Central India as Agent to the Governor-General. In 1900 he was transferred to Hyderabad. In 1902 he received a knighthood. Sir David did much good work in the State and he inaugurated an entire change of policy which changed it from being in 1880 a retrogressive State to one of great prosperity. In 1905 Sir David Barr was called to the India Council by Lord Morley. In 1915 he retired from the India Office.

— **Jack London** was born at San Francisco in 1876. He began an academic career at the University of California, but was diverted from it to go wandering in search of adventure. Out of his experiences he wrote short stories and then his larger works. "The Call of the Wild" made him

famous. Other books of his, almost equally well known, are "The Sea Wolf," "White Fang," "The Cruise of the *Snark*," and "South Sea Tales." They were published at a low price and achieved an enormous sale. Even after Jack London had made literature his profession he retained his love of adventure, and in 1904 served as a war correspondent in Japan, Korea, and Manchuria. In 1914 he went in the same capacity to Mexico, though he did not remain there long. In the interval, in 1906, he started on a seven years' cruise round the world in a 50-foot ketch-rig yacht and disappeared entirely from his friends for two years. His books are extraordinarily popular.

22. Sir George White was born in 1854. He was the son of a Bristol man and spent his life in that city, where he was head of the firm of Messrs. George White & Co., Stock-brokers. Along with the late Sir J. Clifton Robinson he was a pioneer of electric tramways and was also a convinced believer in the future of aviation. He was created a baronet in 1904 and is succeeded by his only son, born in 1882.

23. Prebendary David Anderson was the son of Bishop Anderson and was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took a second class in the Classical Tripos in 1886. A year later he was ordained by the Bishop of London. For ten years he was Rural Dean of Hampton and went to St. George's, Hanover Square, in 1891. He was appointed a prebendary of St. Paul's in 1901. He retired from active ministry in 1911.

— **The Right Hon. Charles Booth** was born in Liverpool in 1840, and was educated there. At 22 years old he became a partner in the family shipping business of Alfred Booth & Co. Later, and till the time of his death, he was on the board of the Booth Steamship Company (Limited). It was not until 1886 that he began working upon the books which have made his name a household word among all students of the social and industrial condition of the working classes. His first volume appeared in 1889 under the title "Life and Labour of the People in East London"; the whole work occupied seventeen years, the last of the series being published in 1903. He served the office of President of the Royal Statistical Society from 1892 to 1894. In 1904 he was sworn of the Privy Council, and he

received honorary degrees from Oxford, Cambridge, and Liverpool Universities and was elected F.R.S.

24. **John Francis Barnett**, born in 1837, was a composer who represented with great accuracy the ideals of the musician of the Early Victorian period. His cantata "The Ancient Mariner" was very popular in its time. He was an able pianist, and later all his time which was not spent on composition was devoted to teaching as a member of the staff of the Royal College of Music and the Guildhall School of Music.

— **The Dowager Lady Ellesmere** died in her 92nd year. She was Lady Mary Louisa Campbell, daughter of the first Earl Cawdor, and married the second Earl of Ellesmere in 1846.

— **Colonel Ernest Harold Fenn, C.I.E.**, was born in 1850 and educated at Sherborne; he joined the Army Medical Staff in 1875, and accompanied Lord Roberts' relief force to Kandahar, being mentioned in dispatches. He took part in the Sudan Campaign in 1885. He afterwards served on the Staffs of Lord Lansdowne and Lord Curzon in India.

— **Sir Hiram Stevens Maxim**, the famous inventor, was born at Sangerville, Maine, U.S.A., in 1840, and at the age of 14 was apprenticed to a coachbuilder, and ten years later he acted as foreman in manufacturing philosophical instruments and as a draughtsman in a shipbuilding yard at New York. He came to Europe in 1881, and made England his home for the latter part of his life. He became naturalised, and received a knighthood in 1901. He was perhaps the most accomplished mechanician of his day, and his inventions were spread over an extraordinarily wide range, but his work in these directions is overshadowed by what he accomplished in the design of automatic guns and in aeronautics. The automatic gun which bears his name was adopted by the British Army in 1889 and by the Navy in 1892, and it is also used by Germany and Russia among other countries. In 1889 he began his flying machine experiments, and the trials of his first aeroplane were carried out at Bexley in 1894.

— **Sir Ralph William Frankland-Payne-Gallwey**, the eldest son of Sir William Payne-Gallwey, was born in 1848. He was educated at

Eton and formerly served in the Rifle Brigade. He was an authority on archery and ancient weapons. Sir Ralph succeeded to the baronetcy in 1881. He married in 1877 the youngest daughter of Mr. T. M. Osborne of Blackrock, County Cork, by whom he had a son and four daughters. He assumed the additional name and arms of Frankland in 1914.

26. **Professor Alexander MacEwen** was born in Edinburgh in 1851. After a distinguished career in Glasgow University he went to Balliol College, Oxford. In 1901 he was appointed Professor of Church History in New College, Edinburgh. He was Moderator of the General Assembly of the United Free Church in 1915-16, and was a distinguished teacher and writer of ecclesiastical history.

27. **Emile Verhaeren** was Belgium's most famous poet, and was recognised in the last five years as the greatest exponent in European poetry of universal ideals. His work consisted of more than forty volumes of lyrical and ditheambric verse, four plays, and a few monographs on painters; and it contains a graphic summary of all that he loved and suffered. He was born at St. Amand, a small village on the Scheldt, in 1855. His father, a rich and pious Catholic, sent him to the College of St. Barbe, at Ghent, where Masterlinck was his fellow-pupil. He afterwards studied law at Louvain and was called to the Bar in 1881; but he forsook the law and chose literature for his profession. It was not until the European war drove him in exile to England that his name became widely known. In the autumn of 1914 the Universities of England, Scotland, and Wales honoured him. His latest volume, "Les Ailes Rouges de la Guerre," contains a fine apostrophe to the grandeur of England. M. Verhaeren was killed while attempting to enter a moving train at Rouen bound for Paris.

28. **Ex-President Steyn**. Martinus Theunis Steyn, was born in 1857. His father was a member of the Executive Council of the Orange Free State, his mother a Miss Wessels, daughter of one of the principal leaders of the Great Trek of 1836. Educated at the Grey College at Bloemfontein he afterwards visited Europe, going first to Holland and then coming to the Inner Temple as a student of law. He remained in England six years, and at the end of that time he was called

to the Bar. Returning to South Africa, he began to practice in Bloemfontein as a barrister. In 1888, at the age of 31, he was made State Attorney of the Orange Free State, and a few months later he became Second Puisne Judge of the High Court. In 1895 he presented himself as a candidate for the Presidency of the Republic, standing as a representative of Dutch sentiment as opposed to the "Englishising" tendencies of his chief opponent. Steyn was elected by a large majority. During the South African war Steyn was one of the most determined of all his people, and his influence during the whole of

this time was not one for good; he pandered to their narrowness and obstinacy. But although he came out of the war crippled in health and overruled in authority, he was firmly established in the hearts of his people, loved and respected by them as he had not been before.

29. **Lady Clementi-Smith**, widow of Sir Cecil Clementi-Smith, formerly Governor of the Straits Settlements, was the daughter of the late Mr. Arthur Newcomen of Kirkleatham Hall, Redcar, and married Sir Cecil Clementi-Smith in 1869.

DECEMBER.

2. **Sir Francesco Paolo Tosti**, the composer, was born in 1846 at Ortona, in the Abruzzi. At the age of 14 he was sent to study music at Naples, and came under famous masters. When he was 30 he began a series of annual visits to England, at 35 he was appointed teacher of singing to the Royal Family, and in 1908 he was knighted. His music had a wide appeal in England; and because of their sweet melody and absence of subtleties his songs were widely known. There are few people who do not know "Good-bye," "Ask me no More," and "For Ever."

— **Arthur Swayne Underwood, M.R.C.S., L.D.S.**, was born in 1854 and held many important appointments in connexion with dental surgery. In 1912 he co-operated with Dr. Smith Woodward in restoring the jaw of the Piltdown skull, and in the following year published the first X-ray photograph of this fossil.

3. **William Henry Peet** was born in 1849, educated at Brighton Grammar School, and entered the employment of Messrs. Simpkin, Marshall & Co. in 1865, and of Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. in 1878. He had a special knowledge of the Bookselling trade, and compiled a "Bibliography of Publishing and Bookselling." He was sub-editor of *Longman's Magazine* and editor of their *Notes on Books*.

4. **Captain Lord Lucas**. Official intimation has been received that Lord Lucas is reported to have died. He had been serving with the Royal Flying Corps in France, and on November 4 made a flight over the German lines, from which he did not return. Lord Lucas was born in 1876, the son of the

Hon. Auberon Herbert (a younger son of the third Earl of Carnarvon) by his marriage with the sister of the seventh and last Earl Cowper, who also held, among other titles, the baronies of Lucas and Dingwall. He succeeded to these baronies on his uncle's death in 1905. He was educated at Bedford Grammar School and Balliol, Oxford. During the South African War he was wounded and his leg had to be amputated below the knee. After a year as private secretary to the Secretary for War, he was appointed Under-Secretary at the War Office in 1908; from this post he passed in 1911 to the Under-Secretaryship for the Colonies, and later in the same year became Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Agriculture. In 1914 he entered the Cabinet as President of the Board of Agriculture and held this office until the formation of the Coalition in May, 1915. Lord Lucas was unmarried and the baronies pass by special remainder to his only sister, the Hon. Nan Ivo Herbert, who was born in 1880.

4. **Sir James Broadwood Lyall, K.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.**, was born in 1838, the second son of the Rev. Alfred Lyall, the philosophic writer and critic of John Stuart Mill, and sometime editor of the *ANNUAL REGISTER*. He was educated at Eton and Haileybury College. He went out to India and was early in his career placed on settlement duty as an assistant. He afterwards became settlement officer of the mountainous district of Kangra and later was appointed Settlement Commissioner of the Multan and Derajat divisions. In 1883 Lord Ripon selected him for the post of Resident of Mysore. In 1887 Lyall succeeded Sir Charles Alcockson as Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab. Sir James Lyall initiated

the Chenab Canal irrigation scheme, the greatest of its kind in India, which added greatly to the prosperity of the country. On the completion of his five years' term Sir James, who had been made a K.C.S.I. at its commencement, received the further distinction of the G.C.I.E.

4. Arthur Mason Worthington, C.B., F.R.S., was born in 1852 and educated at Rugby and Trinity College, Oxford; Owens College, Manchester; and Berlin University in the laboratory of Professor Helmholtz. In 1887 he became headmaster and professor of physics at the Dockyard School, Portsmouth, and in the following year he was appointed to the same posts at the Royal Naval Engineering College, Devonport, where he remained twenty years. From 1909 to 1911 he was professor of physics at the Royal Naval College, Greenwich. He wrote various papers on physical subjects.

5. John D. Archibald was born at Parkersbury, West Virginia, in 1848. He was a well-known financier and president of the Standard Oil Company.

— **Captain Hugh Edwards, D.S.O., R.N.,** was born in 1878. He entered the service as a naval cadet in July, 1886, and was promoted commander in December, 1905, and captain in December, 1913. He was in command of H.M.S. *Theseus* when that vessel was attacked by an enemy submarine in the North Sea in October, 1914, and in August, 1915, he was awarded the D.S.O. for his services in a patrol cruiser.

— **Lord Fitzhardinge, Charles** Paget Fitzhardinge, third baron, was the second son of the first baron, born in 1829. He succeeded his brother in the title in 1896. He was Liberal M.P. for Gloucester from 1862 to 1865. In 1856 he married the only daughter of Mr. Henry Lindow-Lindow; there were no children of the marriage and there is no heir.

— **Rev. William Dunn Macray** was born in 1826 and educated at Magdalen College School, and was afterwards admitted an academical clerk of Magdalen College. He was ordained in 1850. Appointed at the age of 14 assistant in the Bodleian Library, he remained in the service of that institution till 1905, when he retired on a pension. He was superintendent of the New Bodleian Catalogue from 1859

to 1871, when he was created special assistant in the MS. Department, and in 1868 he published his "Annals of the Bodleian Library." In 1870 he was presented by Magdalen College to the rectory of Ducklington, which he held until 1912. He wrote many works and made large additions to historical and archaeological knowledge.

5. Dr. Hans Richter was born in Hungary in 1848. His father was *Capellmeister* at Raab Cathedral. At Vienna he was educated in the Lowenburg school, and was made a member of the Court Chapel. At the Conservatorium of Vienna he learnt to play the horn and the violin, and whilst playing at the opera in the Kärnthnerthor Theatre, Esser, the conductor, introduced him to Wagner who took him to Lucerne. By his mastery over all the orchestral instruments he became one of the most famous musical conductors of his time, and by 1876 he was a man of world-wide fame. His first visit to England was in 1877 for the Wagner concerts at the Albert Hall. He conducted the greater part of each performance, Wagner occasionally taking the baton for special pieces. In 1885 Richter was appointed conductor of the Birmingham Festival and he held the post until 1909. In 1904 the authorities of the Covent Garden Opera induced him to conduct a series of special Wagner performances. One of the wishes of his life was realised when the whole of the trilogy was given at Covent Garden in English in January, 1908. His instinct for discovering the powers of little-known composers was very great and is shown particularly in his championship of the music of Elgar.

— **Major-General Sir Alexander Nelson Rochfort, K.C.B., C.M.G.,** was born in 1850. A distinguished soldier he was mentioned in dispatches and received his brevet of major for his services in the Sudan in 1885; and for his services during the South African War he received the C.B. He was again mentioned in dispatches and decorated for his work during the Somaliland operations in 1902-4. He afterwards held the post of Inspector of Horse and Field Artillery, and in 1910 was appointed to the Governorship of Jersey.

7. Lady Tennyson was married to Lord Tennyson, son of the poet, in 1884, and was with him in Australia during his term of office as Governor-General. She was the daughter of

Charles John Boyle, a kinsman of the eighth Earl of Cork.

7. Major-General William Dalrymple Tompson, C.B., was born in 1833, and educated at Cheltenham College. He entered the Army in 1852 and became Captain three years later, Major in 1869, Lieutenant-Colonel in 1877, Colonel in 1881, and Major-General (retired) in 1884. He was present during the Crimean campaign, was mentioned in dispatches, awarded the medal with clasp, the Turkish medal, and appointed Knight of the Legion of Honour. For his services during the Afghan War he received the medal with clasp and the C.B.

— **Baron Marochetti** was formerly Italian Minister in Copenhagen and Ambassador in Petrograd, in which capacity he played a leading part in the Russo-Italian entente. He was a personal friend of Queen Victoria and King Edward.

— **The Duke of Frias** was descended from the famous Grand Constable of Castile, and was the fifteenth of his line. He married a daughter of Vice-Admiral Sir Charles G. F. Knowles, and his mother also was an English lady. He was educated at Eton. A great part of his life was spent in the Spanish Diplomatic Service. His brother, the Count of Oropesa, succeeds him.

8. Sir Roland Vaughan Williams was the fifth son of the Right Hon. Sir Edward Vaughan Williams, born in 1838. Educated at Westminster and Christ Church, he was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn in November, 1861, and went the South-Eastern Circuit. In 1889 he took silk, and in 1890 he was made a Judge of the Queen's Bench Division in succession to Manisty. In the Long Vacation of 1897 there were several changes in the Court of Appeal, and Lord Ludlow was succeeded by Vaughan Williams, and during the next few years changes were very frequent, and it became the practice for Lord Justice Vaughan Williams to preside over Chancery Appeals. With the advent of a Liberal Government in 1906 the question of the Anglican Church in Wales came to the front, and Vaughan Williams was selected to preside over these inquiries. His great work on Bankruptcy, of which eight editions have appeared, established him as a man of great learning. Sir Roland Vaughan

Williams retired from the Bench in 1914.

9. Pierre Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, the eminent French economist, was born in 1813. The study of political economy was his life-work, and his attainments, which earned him numerous academic distinctions in his own country, were acknowledged abroad by the bestowal of honorary degrees in the Universities of Cambridge, Edinburgh, Dublin, and Bologna.

10. General Sir George Luck, G.C.B., joined the Army in 1858 at the age of 18; he served successively in the Inniskilling Dragoons and the 15th Hussars. In 1884 he was appointed to command the Sind District, and from 1887 to 1893 he was Inspector-General of Cavalry in India. From 1895 to 1898 he was Inspector-General of Cavalry in Great Britain and Ireland, and he returned to India to command the Bengal Army. In the Afghan and the Boer Wars he commanded the 15th Hussars, of which he became Colonel in 1904. In the following year he was promoted to General and was appointed Lieutenant of the Tower, a post which he held for two years. He was created K.C.B. in 1907 and G.C.B. in 1909.

— **Clement Reid, F.R.S.,** was born in 1853. He was the late District Geologist on the Survey of England and Wales, and author of numerous publications on geology.

— **Lord Teignmouth** was born in 1844, the second son of the second Baron, and succeeded his brother as fourth Baron in 1915. He held a commission at one time in the Royal Artillery and reached the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel. Lord Teignmouth married in 1894, but leaves no issue. He is succeeded in the title, which is an Irish one, by his brother, Commander the Hon. Henry Noel Shore, late R.N., who was born in 1847.

12. Joseph William Comyns Carr was born in 1849 and educated at London University. He was called to the Bar, but his work there is negligible; and afterwards began journalism, where he made his mark as art critic to the *Pall Mall Gazette* in the early seventies. He was the English editor of *L'Art*, and became one of the leading art critics of his time. Among other enterprises he founded and edited the *English Illustrated Magazine*. Later he took up work for the

stage and became an adapter and collaborator for the theatre. Beginning in 1882 with "Far From the Madding Crowd," he produced some sixteen plays. He next took up theatrical management and for three years he had the Comedy Theatre, and he was managing director of the Lyceum Theatre in the years that followed Sir Henry Irving's surrender of his interest in it. He was a great talker; and while still a very young man made a reputation as an after-dinner speaker.

12. Iwao Oyama, Prince and Field-Marshal, was born in 1842, a native of Satsuma Fief. At the age of 28 he was nominated by the Meiji Government to proceed to Europe for the purpose of studying military tactics and strategy. In 1878 he was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-General and from this time he devoted his whole energy to the evolution of a military system which should embody all the best features of Occidental organisations; and Germany was taken as Oyama's model. In 1894 at the outbreak of war with China, Oyama was appointed to command the Second Army. For his distinguished services he received the baton of Field-Marshal (1898) and became Chief of the General Staff, being honoured also with the title of Marquis. He vacated his post at the General Staff in favour of General Kawakami, but at the outbreak of war with Russia Oyama was again presiding at the General Staff. His services in the war with Russia were rewarded with the title of Prince. He was made an honorary member of the Order of Merit in May, 1906. In the same year he relinquished his post of Chief of the General Staff. In 1914 he was given the office of the Privy Seal.

— **Antonin Mercié**, the French sculptor, died at the age of 71. He was a member of the Institute and Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour. His "Gloria Victis" in 1874 gained for him the medal of honour at the Salon. M. Mercié was also a painter.

14. Major-General Sir William George Knox, Colonel-Commandant, R.A., was born in 1847, the second son of the late General T. E. Knox, C.B. He entered the Royal Artillery from Woolwich in 1867 and saw service in the Abyssinian Expedition, 1867-68, the Ashanti War, 1874, the Afghan War, 1878-79, the Zulu and Transvaal Campaign, 1879, and the South African War, 1899-1902. For his services in

the last campaign he received the K.C.B.

14. Professor Thomas Purdie, LL.D., F.R.S., was born in 1843, and educated at Edinburgh Academy. His early youth was spent in the Argentine Republic. On his return home he studied Chemistry at the Royal School of Mines, afterwards continuing his studies at the University of Wurzburg. He was for several years demonstrator at the Royal College of Science, South Kensington. He was appointed to the Chair of Chemistry in St. Andrews in 1884, and held it until 1909, when he retired.

15. General Adolphus Brett Crosbie, R.M.L.I., obtained his first commission in 1864, and attained the rank of General in 1910, in which year he retired. He served in China in 1867-69, and commanded the Royal Marines in the Ashanti War and the Congo Expedition.

— **Sir Frederick Eve** was educated at St. Bartholomew's Hospital and at Leipzig, and early devoted himself to the study of surgery. His connexion with the London Hospital was a long one, and it was while acting as senior surgeon to that institution that he received his knighthood from the King. He was a member of the Council and Vice-President of the Royal College of Surgeons, and lecturer on surgery at the London School of Medicine for Women.

— **Professor Hugo Münsterberg** was born in 1863 at Danzig. He studied philosophy, natural science, and medicine in the Universities of Leipzig and Heidelberg and in 1887 became assistant professor in the University of Freiburg. His work here attracted the attention of William James, who summoned him to Harvard and made him the first director of its "laboratory of psychology."

— **Lady White**, wife of Sir Luke White, M.P., born in 1846, was daughter of Mr. A. Wood, of York, and married Sir Luke in 1869.

— **Prince Henckel von Donnersmarck** was born at Breslau in 1880. He belonged to an old landowning stock in Silesia, where he had extensive estates.

18. Robert Armstrong Yerburgh was the third son of the Rev. Richard Yerburgh, Vicar of Sleaford, Lincoln.

shire. He was born in 1853 and educated at Rossall, Harrow, and University College, Oxford. After being called to the Bar in 1880 he acted for a short period as private secretary to Mr. Akers-Douglas when Patronage Secretary, and afterwards to Mr. W. H. Smith when First Lord of the Treasury. He was for twenty-six years Unionist member for Chester, and since 1900 he had been President of the Navy League.

18. Sir Frederick Herbert Ashman, second baronet, was born in 1875. His father was the first Lord Mayor of Bristol. The title now becomes extinct.

19. Captain de Beauchamps, the famous aviator, was killed by a bullet in an air-fight in the Douaumont region. He achieved some of the greatest aeronautical events during the European War. Captain de Beauchamps was 29 years of age.

— **Ex-King Theebaw** succeeded his father King Mindoon in 1878. King Mindoon ruled Ava, Upper Burma, despotically, but on the whole prosperously for 26 years. King Theebaw began his reign by committing horrible crimes; and extreme disorder prevailed throughout the country. Diplomatic relations with Great Britain were broken off, and ultimately at the end of 1885 King Theebaw's dynasty was overthrown, followed by the annexation by the British of Upper Burma. Theebaw was sent to Ratanagiri, on the Kolkán coast of Western India, where he died 30 years later.

21. Daniel Oliver, F.R.S., was born in 1829. He was Professor of Botany at University College, London, from 1861 to 1888, and afterwards Keeper of the Herbarium and Library at Kew Gardens, and published several works on botany.

— **General Sir Henry Brasnell Tuson, K.C.B.**, was born in 1836. He was educated at Christ's Hospital and King's College, London, and entered the Royal Marine Artillery as Second Lieutenant in 1854, being made Lieutenant in 1856. He saw considerable service during the second China War; was promoted Captain in 1865 and Major in 1877, and two years later commanded the Royal Marine Artillery, which, with a detachment of Royal Marine Light Infantry, was sent to South Africa. In 1880 he was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-

Colonel for special service in the Zulu War. For his services throughout the Egyptian campaign of 1882 he received the C.B., the medal with clasp, the Khedive's star and the third class of the Medjidie. In 1893, when he was promoted to Lieutenant-General, he succeeded Sir Howard Jones as Deputy Adjutant-General of Marines, holding this post until March, 1900.

22. J. J. O'Kelly was born in Dublin in 1845. At the age of 18 he joined the Foreign Legion of the French Army and served in the campaign for the suppression of the Arabian tribes in Algeria in the early sixties. He was taken prisoner but escaped into Texas and finally to New York, and immediately returned to France and again served in the French army till the capitulation of Paris to the Germans in 1870. He next took up journalism and obtained a post on the *New York Herald*. O'Kelly afterwards gave up journalistic work in order to engage actively in Irish conspiracies; but he soon found a better way of helping Ireland, being returned to the House of Commons, as a follower of Parnell, in 1880. He was imprisoned with the Irish leader in Kilmainham Gaol in 1881. At the General Election of 1892 he lost his seat for North Kew-common, but in 1895 he recaptured it for the Parnellites and represented that constituency till the end of his career.

— **Dr. Charles Russell** was born in 1840. He was for nearly 20 years editor of the *Glasgow Herald*.

23. Harry H. Marks was born in 1855 and educated at University College, London, and in Brussels. He then went to the United States and started his career as a journalist there. Afterwards he returned to England and in 1895 he entered Parliament as M.P. for Tower Hamlets and held the seat for five years; from 1904 to 1910 he sat for the Isle of Thanet.

— **Hon. Thomas Henry William Pelham, C.B.**, born in 1847, was the son of the third Earl of Chichester. He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, called to the Bar by the Inner Temple, and practised on the Home and South-Eastern Circuits from 1871 to 1882. He became legal adviser to the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council in 1882 and to the Board of Agriculture in 1889. He was appointed by the Board of Trade to settle canal rates in 1893 and

railway rates in 1895. In 1888 he married Louisa Keith Bruce.

23. The Very Rev. Arthur Percival Purey-Cust, D.D., Dean of York, the fourth son of the Hon. William Cust, Commissioner of Customs, was born in 1828 and educated at the Proprietary School at Lee, Kent, and Brasenose College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1850. In 1851 he was ordained Deacon by Dr. Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, and priest in 1852 by Dr. Murray, Bishop of Rochester. In 1853 Lord Brownlow nominated him to the rectory of Cheddington, in the Diocese of Oxford. In 1862 Dr. Wilberforce promoted him to the important benefice of St. Mary, Reading. He became Archdeacon of Buckingham and Vicar of Aylesbury in 1875. When the Deanery of York fell vacant by the death in 1880 of the Hon. Augustus Duncombe, one of Mr. Disraeli's last acts during his 1874-80 Ministry was to recommend Archdeacon Cust for this office. The Dean married in 1854 Lady Emma Bess Bligh, daughter of the fifth Earl of Darnley, and leaves a daughter and two sons.

24. Sir William Egebric Bigge was younger brother of Lord Stamfordham. He was educated at New College, Oxford, and entering the Civil Service of Burma rose to be Judge of the Chief Court, Lower Burma. After his retirement he was knighted in 1909.

— **James Round, P.C.,** was born in 1842 and educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford; he was called to the Bar in 1868. As a Unionist Mr. Round represented East Essex in the House of Commons from 1868 to 1885 and the Harwich Division from 1885 to 1906.

— **Sir William Erskine Ward, K.C.S.I.,** died in his 79th year. Educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, he entered the Bengal Civil Service. He was Chief Commissioner of Assam from 1891 to 1896, when he retired.

— **Captain Henry M. Jones, V.C.,** was born in 1831 and entered the Army in April, 1849, when he became an ensign in the 18th Foot. In 1854 he exchanged into the 7th Fusiliers, with whom he served in the Crimea. He was severely wounded at the battle of Alma on September 20, 1854, and slightly wounded at the assault of the Quarries on June 7, 1855, on which day he won the V.C.; at the time of his

death Captain Jones was the oldest surviving holder of this honour. He retired from the Army in 1857, and was subsequently engaged in the Diplomatic Service.

25. Rev. the Hon. William Henry Fremantle, D.D., the second son of the late Sir T. F. Fremantle, who was raised to the peerage as Baron Cottesloe in 1874, was born in 1831 and educated at Cheam Preparatory School and Eton. He proceeded to Balliol and in 1853 he graduated with a first class in Lit. Hum. In 1854 he was elected to a Fellowship at All Souls and in 1855 was ordained deacon (priest in 1856) by Dr. Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford. In 1857 he accepted from All Souls College the vicarage of Lewknor, Oxfordshire, which he held for eight years. Mr. Gladstone in 1882 nominated Dr. Fremantle to the important benefice of St. Mary, Bryanston Square; but in the same year he resigned his benefice on a summons to return to Balliol as Fellow, Tutor, and Chaplain, and almost at the same time he was appointed to a residentiary canonry at Canterbury. In 1895 the Hon. W. R. Fremantle, Dean of Ripon, died at an advanced age, and Lord Rosebery nominated the nephew to succeed his uncle. It was not until September, 1915, that Dr. Fremantle resigned the Deanery of Ripon after holding it for twenty years. The late Dean was twice married, first in 1863 to Isabella, youngest daughter of Sir Culling Eardley, by whom he had a large family, and second in 1903 to Sophia, eldest daughter of the late Major G. T. Stuart.

26. Sir Jesse Herbert, born in 1851, was the third son of the late Jesse Herbert and was called to the Bar by the Middle Temple. He subsequently became Professor of International Law at Canton University and Legal Adviser to the South China Government. He had been associated with the work of the Liberal Party at headquarters under seven Chief Whips. He was knighted in 1911.

— **Reginald John Smith, K.C.,** was born in 1857. He entered Eton as a collegier and afterwards proceeded to King's where he took the degree of LL.M. as well as that of B.A. Afterwards he was called to the Bar, and from 1886 to 1894 "devilled" for Sir Charles Russell, as he then was. But in 1894 he entered the business of Smith, Elder & Co., Publishers, taking silk on retiring from the Bar. Three years later he became editor of

the *Cornhill Magazine*, and on his father-in-law's death in 1901, principal of the firm. The tradition of the house was connected with the names of Charlotte Brontë, of Mrs. Gaskell, of Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barratt Browning, and of Thackeray. In 1904-5 Reginald Smith was President of the Publishers' Association and again in 1916. He was also a member of the Executive Committee of the Royal Literary Fund, a director of the Booksellers' Provident Institution, and a member of the Council of the Royal Geographical Society. He also took an active part as a Governor of the London Hospital. He married in 1893 the youngest daughter of George Murray Smith, the publisher.

30. Sir Charles Parry Hobhouse, third baronet, was born in Calcutta in 1825, the son of Mr. Henry William Hobhouse, for many years resident in Bengal. He had close hereditary ties with India. His uncle, Sir John Cam Hobhouse, Bt., afterwards Lord Broughton, was twice President of the Board of Control. Educated at East

Sheen and at Rugby under Dr. Arnold, Charles Hobhouse passed through the East India Company's College at Haileybury, and in 1844 returned to Calcutta. He had alternating executive and judicial experience in different districts. In 1867 he was appointed a Puisne Judge of the Calcutta High Court, and remained on the Bench till he left India at the close of 1870, finally retiring from the service in 1872. Lord Broughton's peerage lapsed on his death in 1869, but the baronetcy inherited from his father passed to his nephew who thus became Sir Charles Hobhouse in that year. He is succeeded in the title by his son, the Right Hon. C. E. Hobhouse, M.P. for East Bristol since 1900, who was born in 1862.

30. Sir Reginald Ambrose Mowbray, Bt., was born in 1852, and succeeded his brother in the title in July, 1916, and thus held it for little more than five months. He was educated at Christ Church and was unmarried. He is succeeded in the title by a younger brother.

INDEX.

The figures between [] refer to PART I.

[*Speeches in Parliament are entered under their subjects under the heading "Parliamentary Speeches," and those outside Parliament under the speaker's name.*]

ACCIDENTS.—EXPLOSIONS, munition factories, England, N., 25; Kent, 10, 22; Yorkshire, 19. Paris, fort of St. Denis, 7
ADDISON, Dr., appointed Minister of Munitions, [199]
ADMIRALTY, Board of, changes in the, [196]
AEROPLANES.—ALLIED, over Adrianople, 10; Constantinople, 10; Zeebrugge, 8. GERMAN, over Kent, 3; Margate, 22
AFGHANISTAN.—GERMAN mission, failure, [192], [299]. NEUTRALITY, policy of, [299]
AFRICA, EAST.—ABYSSINIA, [320]. BRITISH EAST AFRICA, [318]. GERMAN EAST AFRICA, conquest of, [318], 7, 15, 19; Moshi, captured, [318]; Smuts, General, military operations, [318], 4, 17; Van Deventer, General, military operations, [319]. NYASSALAND, [316]. PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA, [316]
— NORTH.—MOROCCO, [319]; Gourand, General, appointed Resident-General, 25
— SOUTH.—BUDGET, [313]. FINANCE, [313]. IMPERIALISM and Nationalism, contest between, [312]. LEGISLATIVE measures, [314]. OVERSEAS Contingents, [313]. POPULATION, [315]. RAILWAY, revenue, [314]; Rhodesia, Northern and Southern Territories, scheme for the amalgamation, [315]. SMUTS, General, in command of the British troops in East Africa, 4; leaves Durban, 4; Steyn, M. T., death, [315], 200. TRADING with the Enemy Bill, [315]. UNIVERSITY Acts, [314]. WAR, expenditure, [314]
— WEST.—BELGIAN Congo, [319]. CAMEROON, conquest of, [317], 1, 5, 6, 68-70. NIGERIA, [317]; Enemy Properties, sale of, [181], [317]. TOGO-LAND, [317]
AGNEW, Sir S., Obit., 178
AIR Board, proposed creation, [110], [123]; established, [202]
AIR RAIDS.—GERMAN, [37], 3, 12, 19, 20
AIR Service, work of the, [180]
ALBANIA, [282]. SKUTARI, occupied, 32
ALBERT Hall, meeting, [159], 17

Alcantara and German raider, engagement between, 6
ALEXANDRA, Queen, attends Lord Kit-chener's memorial service, 15
ALIENS, registration of, 5
ALLAN, J. A., Obit., 167
ALLEN & Unwin, publication of "The European Anarchy," 98
ALLIES, Conference in Paris, [76], [89], [96], 9, 15; reply to the peace overtures from Germany, [211]-[214]
AMALGAMATED Properties of Rhodesia v. The Globe and Phoenix Gold Mining Co., case of, 24
AMERICA.—Vide Canada, Mexico, Newfoundland, United States
— SOUTH.—ARGENTINA, Budget, [353]. Irigoyen, Dr. H., elected President, [352]. Plaza, Dr. de la, at the opening of Congress, [352]; attempt on his life, [353]. Population, [351]. Presidential election, candidates, [352]. BRAZIL, Budget, [353]. Japan, relations with, [353]. Muller, Dr. L., on foreign policy, [353]. CHILI, [353]. PARAGUAY, [354]. URUGUAY, [354]
ANDERSON, Prebendary D., Obit., 199
ANDREWS, Rt. Hon. T., Obit., 187
ANGST, Sir H., Honorary Consul-General for Switzerland, retirement, 9
ANNIVERSARIES, celebration of, Cervantes, 11; Shakespeare, 11
ANTI-CONSCRIPTION Council, protest against the Military Service Act, [117]
ANZAC Day, celebrated in London, 11
Appam, British steamship, captures German crew, 3
ARCHIBALD, J. D., Obit., 202
ARMY, British, in France, [1], [10], [27]-[32], [34]; in Salonika, 34-36; in the Dardanelles, 36-45; casualties, [3]-[7], [31], [34], 1
— Council, the new, 26
ART.—Retrospect of: BRITISH Museum, closed, 3, 136. BURLINGTON Fine Arts Club, 137. CIVIC Arts Association, 138. GOUPEL Gallery, 137. LEICESTER Gallery, 137. NATIONAL Gallery, 134-136. New English Art Club, 137. ROYAL Academy, 136. SALES, 133. TATE Gallery, 136. WALLACE Gallery, closed, 136

- ASHMAN, Sir F. H., Obit., 205
 ASQUITH, Rt. Hon. H. H., at the Conference in Paris, [96]; at the Franco-British Inter-Parliamentary Committee, [110]; result of his visit to Ireland, [131]; at Fife, [136]; Queen's Hall, [159]; on the output of coal, [178]; at the Guildhall, [184]; the Albert Hall, 17; resignation, [197], 24; in Rome, [226]
 ASQUITH, Mrs., libel action, 8
 ASQUITH, Lieut. R., Obit., 187
 ASSOCIATION of Chambers of Commerce, meeting, [75]
 ATHERTON, G., "Mrs. Balfame," 114
 ATKINS, Brevet-Colonel A. R. C., appointed Director of Supplies and Transport, 8
 AUGUST Bank holiday, postponed, [155], 18
 AUSTRALIA.—BUDGET, [358]. CABINET, the new, [358]. Coal-miners' strike, [358]. Conscription Bill, [356]; views against, [357], 24. HUGHES, W. M., in England, [355]; policy, [355]. LOAN, issue of a, [358]. POPULATION, [3]. VOLUNTEERS, number of, [356]. WAR, result of the, [355]
 AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.—ANDRASSY, Count, at Berlin and Vienna, [252]. BATTISTI, Bagnor, trial, [252]. Bohemia, [249]. Burian, Baron, on the origin of the war, [249]; Finance Minister, [256]. CABINET, the new, [256]. Clam-Martinitz, Count, Prime Minister, [256]. Czernin, Count O., Foreign Minister, [256]. Czernovitz, retreat from, [16], 15. DALMATIA, [248]. Finance, [248]. GALICIA, [249], [253]. GORIZIA captured, [32]-[34]. HOHENLOHE, Prince K., Finance Minister, [255]; resignation, [256]. INDEPENDENCE party, [250]. Italy, military operations against, [11]-[13], [32]-[35]. KAROLYI, Count, secession, [250]; war policy, [251]. Koerber, Dr. von, Prime Minister, [253]; resignation, [256]. MINISTERS, the new, [256]. PEACE proposals, [255]. Poland, independence, [253], [270]. Population, [4]. Portugal, war with, [290]. REICHSRATH, closed, [247]. RUMANIA, war declared against, [36], [40], [276], 19. Russia, military operations against, [2], [14]-[19], 15, 16, 18. STURGEK, Count K., assassinated, [252], 22, 193. TRANSYLVANIA, invasion, [43]-[46]. WAR, casualties, [3]-[7]. [18], [47]; expenditure, [232], [248]
 — Francis Joseph, Emperor of, illness and death, [254], 23, 197-199; funeral, [255]
 — Karl Franz Joseph, Emperor of, accession, [255]; coronation, [256]
 AWDRY, Sir R. D., Obit., 191
 BARTLE, Surgeon-General W., appointed Assistant Director-General Army Medical Services, 8
 BACCELLI, Dr. G., Obit., 154
 BAGGE, Sir A. T., Obit., 159
 BAILEY, Capt. the Hon. W., D.S.O., conferred, 21
 BAIRD, Major, appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Air Board, [201]
 BAKER, Lady, Obit., 162
 BALFOUR, Rt. Hon. A. J., at the Guildhall, [73], [184]; the British Imperial Council of Commerce, [185]; appointed Foreign Secretary, [199]; Order of Merit conferred, 14
 BALFOUR, J. S., Obit., 160
 BALL, Sir C., Obit., 163
 BALZANI, Count U., Obit., 161
 BANKS, closed to the public, 16
Baralong, case of the, [58], [232]
 BARNES, Rt. Hon. G., appointed Pensions Minister, [199], [200]
 BARNETT, J. F., Obit., 200
 BARONETRIES conferred, Boot, Sir J., 25; Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H., 25; Goshen, W. E., 1; Sturdee, Vice-Adm. Sir D., 1
 BAROTSELAND, Lewanika, King of, Obit., 159
 BARR, Lieut.-Col. Sir D. W. K., Obit., 199
 BARRETT, Sir W. S., appointed Constable of Lancaster Castle, 14
 BARTER, Sir R., Obit., 183
 BATHURST, Capt. C., appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Food Control Department, 25
 BATTEN, Colonel J. M., Obit., 162
 BAVARIA, O. W. L. A. W., King of, Obit., 192
 BEATTY, Admiral Sir D., at the Battle of Jutland, [22]-[24]; in Command of the Grand Fleet, [39], [196]
 BEAUCHAMPS, Capt. de, Obit., 205
 BECK, A. C., appointed Vice-Chamberlain of the Household, [200]
 BECK, E. A., Obit., 167
 BEECHAM, Sir J., Obit., 144, 193
 BELGIUM.—ALLIED Powers, declaration, [282]. BISSING, General Von, Governor-General, [288]. Bryce Report on the conduct of the Germans, 54-68. GHENT, the new University of, [233]. WAR, casualties, [7]
 BELGIUM'S Day, celebrated in London, 17
 BENBOW, Sir H., Obit., 193
 BENNETT, A., "These Twain," 116; "The Lion's Share," 117
 BENSON, E. F. "David Blaize," 113
 BENSON, Major-General Sir F. W., Obit., 184
 BENSON, M., Obit., 170
 BETHELL, Adm. the Hon. Sir A. E., appointed Commander-in-Chief at Plymouth, 25
 BEVERIDGE, W. H., appointed Second Secretary to the Ministry of Food, 26
 BIDDULPH, Lady, Obit., 155
 BIGGE, Sir W. E., Obit., 206
 BIGLAND, A., appointed Assistant Director of Munitions in the War Propellant Department, 4
 BILLS.—COMPULSORY Military Service, [51] *see* Military. Consolidated Fund, [74], [76], [90], [91]. DARDANELLES and Mesopotamia Commissions, [151]. Daylight Saving, [122]. FINANCE, [101], [102], [126], [137], [153]. MEMBERS of Parliament, re-election, [152]. Military Service, [51], [112], 1, 13; second reading, [52]-[54], 2; amendments in Committee, [54]-[56], [114]-[116]; third reading, [56]; in the

BILLS, *continued*.

- Lords, [56], [116]; passed, [57]; in operation, [78], 16. Ministries and Secretaries, New, [202]. Munitions of War, [50]. NATIONAL Gallery, [190], 135. PARLIAMENT, [164]. Parliament and Local Elections, [163], [165]. Parliament and Registration Act, [61], [162]. Parliamentary Register and elections, [183]. Pensions [185]-[187]. Plural Voting, [61]. REGISTER, Special, [162], [163], [182]. Registration of Business Names, [181]. Special Register, [162], [163], [182]. UNIVERSAL Compulsory Military Service, [113] *see* Military. VOLUNTEER, [195]
- BIRDWOOD, Lieut.-Gen. Sir W., in command of the Dardanelles Army, 33, 37; evacuation of the Peninsula, 37-45
- BIRRELL, Rt. Hon. A., Chief Secretary for Ireland, resignation, [121]
- BIRTH-RATE, 130, 131
- BISSET, Colonel Sir W. S. S., Obit., 181
- BLORE, Canon G. J., Obit. 167
- BLUNT, Sir J. E., Obit., 174
- BLYTHSWOOD, Rev. Lord, Obit., 190
- BON, Dr. G. le, "Enseignements Psychologiques de la Guerre Européenne," 100
- BOOKS, rate of discount reduced, 2
- BOOTH, Rt. Hon. C., Obit., 199
- BOOTH, E. C. "Fondie," 119
- BOUCAULT, Mrs. D., Obit., 195
- BOWES & Bowes, publication of, "The Main Illusion of Pacifism," 101
- BOWYEAR, H. W. T., appointed Charity Commissioner, 3, 7
- BOWYER-SMITH, Sir W., Obit., 180
- BOYD, E. C. P., appointed Metropolitan Police Magistrate, 18
- BOYLE, Sir C., Obit., 188
- BOYLE, Hon. Mrs. R., Obit., 184
- BRACE, W., appointed Under-Secretary of the Home Office, [200]
- BRAGG, Prof. W. H., awarded the Rumford Medal, 126
- BRAND, Rear-Adm. the Hon T., Obit., 195
- BRANDON, Second-Lieut. A. de B., D.S.O., conferred, 21
- BREAD, increase in the price of, 1, 3, 22, 23
- BRETEUIL, Marq. de, Obit., 195
- BRIDGEMAN, W. C., Assistant-Director of the War Trade Department, 7; appointed Secretary to the Ministry of Labour, [201]
- BRIDGES, Dr., "The Spirit of Man," 105
- BRINDLE, Bishop, Obit., 175
- BRITISH Army. *See* Army
- Association, at Newcastle, 20, 126-130
- Empire Union, meeting, [196]
- Museum, closed, 3, 136
- Red Cross Society, amount of *The Times* fund, 16
- BROADLEY, A. M., Obit., 167
- BRODIE, Dr. T. G., Obit., 184
- BROOKE, Rev. S., Obit., 164
- BROWNLOW, Field-Marshal Sir C. H., Obit., 165
- BRUNTON, Sir T. L., Obit., 188
- Brussels*, steamer, captured by the Germans, [156], 15
- BRYCE Report, on the conduct of the Germans in Belgium, 54-65; the sack of Louvain, 60-62; conclusions of the Committee, 62-64; treatment of civilian population, 64; offences against combatants, 66; general conclusions, 67; appendix, 67
- BUCK, Sir E. C., Obit., 177
- BUDGET, The, [97]-[101]
- BULGARIA. — POPULATION, [4]. WAR, casualties, [6]; result of the, [280]
- BURGESS, Dr. J., Obit., 191
- BURNEY, Adm. Sir C., appointed Second Sea Lord, [196]
- BURNHAM, Lord, Obit., 154
- BUTLER, Major-Gen. R. H. K., appointed Deputy Chief of the General Staff, 2
- BUXTON, Lady V., Obit., 183
- BYTHELL, J. K., Obit., 184
- CABS, whistling for, at nights, prohibited in London, 19
- CARRD, Sir J., value of his estate, 18
- CAMBRIDGE University, Stanton, Dr. V. H., elected Regius Professor of Divinity, 4
- CAMBRIDGE University Press, publication of "Germany, 1815-1890," 92; "On the Art of Writing," 105; "Scientific Papers," 107
- CAMPBELL, Col. D. F., Obit., 186
- CAMPBELL, Rt. Hon. J. H., appointed Attorney-General for Ireland, [146], 10; Lord Chief Justice, 24, 25
- CAMPBELL, Lieut.-General Sir W. P., in command at Chester, 6
- CANADA. — ALCOHOL, prohibition, [348]. Army, [344], [349]. BRITISH COLUMBIA, elections, [348]. Budget, [345]. CONNAUGHT, Duke of, at the opening of Parliament, [344]. DEVONSHIRE, Duke of, Governor-General, [177], [348], 16. KEMP, A. E., Minister of Militia, [349]. LOANS, issue of, [345], [349]. NOVA SCOTIA, elections, [348]. ONTARIO, bilingual schools, [347]. Ottawa, Parliament Buildings destroyed by fire, [346], 4. PARLIAMENT, opened, [344]. Population, [3]. QUEBEC, election, [346]. SEVIGNY, A., elected Speaker, [344]. WAR, casualties, [349]; expenditure, [345]. White, T., on the Budget, [345]
- CANNON Street Hotel, meetings, [69], [196]
- CARLTON Club, meeting, [142]
- CARR, J. W. C., Obit., 203
- CARSON, Sir E., appointed First Lord of the Admiralty, [199]
- CASEMENT, Sir R., arrested, [118], 11; at Bow Street Police Court, 13; committed for trial, 13; trial, [139], 16; appeal, [140], 17; execution, [140], 18
- CASSEL, Captain, appointed Judge-Advocate-General, 21
- CASSELL & Co., publication of, "The Lion's Share," 117
- CASTLE, Vice-Adm. W. M. F., Obit., 169
- CATHCART, Sir R. A. E., Obit., 170
- CAVE, Sir G., appointed Home Secretary, [199]
- CAWLEY, Sir F., appointed Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, [199]
- CATZER, Sir C., Obit., 190
- CECIL, Lord R., appointed Minister of Blockade, [70], [199]

- CHALMERS, Sir R., appointed Under-Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 12
- CHAMBERLAIN, Rt. Hon. A., appointed Secretary for India, [199]
- CHAMBERLAIN, N., appointed Director-General of National Service, [205]
- CHARMES, M. F., Obit., 153
- CHARWOOD, Lord, "Abraham Lincoln," 96
- CHARRINGTON, Mrs. C., Obit., 187
- CHATELIER, Prof. H. L. le, awarded the Davy Medal, 126
- CHATTA, Singh, Sepoy, V.C. awarded, 15
- CHELMSFORD, Lord, appointed Viceroy of India, 2
- CHESHIRE, restriction on the sale of liquor, 4
- CHESTERFIELD, Lord, appointed Master of the Horse, [200]
- CHINA.—CABINET, the new, [307]; reconstruction, [309]. JAPAN, relations with, [310]. Li-Yuan-Hung, Gen., Vice-President, assumes office, [308]. MINISTERS, the new, [307], [309]. Monarchy, result of the proposed restoration, [306]. NANKING, conference at, [308]. SZCHUAN, revolt, [307]. YUAN-Shih-Kai, Emperor, coronation, [306]; postponed, [307]; his Cabinet, [307]; death, [308], 173. YUNNAN, revolt, [306]
- CHRISTIAN, Adm. H., Obit., 174
- CHRISTIES, sale at, 18
- CITY Carlton Club, meeting, [90]
- CLAM, Lieut.-Col. Du P. de, Obit., 186
- CLANMORRIS, Lord, Obit., 195
- CLANRICARDE, Lord, value of his estate, 12; Obit., 167
- CLARENDON PRESS, publication of "Epidemics Resulting from War," 103
- CLARK, Sir W., Comptroller-General of the Commercial Intelligence Department, 22
- CLAYTON, Canon H. E., Obit., 195
- CLEMENTI-SMITH, Sir C., Obit., 157
- CLEMENTI-SMITH, Lady, Obit., 201
- Cleopatra*, H.M.S., sinks a German destroyer, [21], 9
- CLIFFORD, Lord, of Chudleigh, Obit., 179
- CLIVE, General, E. H., Obit., 161
- CLOCKS in London, chimes and striking discontinued, 3
- CLYDE, J. A., appointed Lord Advocate, [199]
- CLYDE Workers' Committee, organises strikes, [94]-[96]
- COAL freights, rise in 2
- mining industry, Conference, [178]
- COCAINE, sale of, importation prohibited, [150]
- COFFEY, G., Obit., 185
- COKE, Hon. H. J., Obit., 195
- COLEBROOKE, Lord, appointed Captain of the Gentlemen at Arms, [200]
- COLTHURST, Capt. J. C. B., result of the Court-Martial on, 15
- COMMERCE, British Imperial Council of, meeting, [135]
- COMMERCE and Finance in 1916, 145-152
- COMMERCIAL Intelligence Department, formed, 22
- COMMODITIES, price of, Committee on, 15
- CONINGHAM, General W., Obit., 159
- CONNAUGHT, H.R.H., Duke of, return from Canada, 22
- CONNELL, J. Obit., 183
- CONSTABLE & Co., publication of, "Abraham Lincoln," 96; "Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion," 111; "Essays in War-Time," 100
- COOK, H. F., appointed trustee of the National Portrait Gallery, 11
- COOKSON, Lieut.-Com. E. C., awarded the V.C., 3
- COOPER, C. A., Obit., 167
- CORNWALL, Sir E., appointed Controller of the Household, [200]
- CORNWELL, J., awarded the V.C., 20
- COULTON, G. G., "The Main Illusions of Pacificism," 101
- COWANS, Lieut.-Gen. Sir J. S., Member of the Army Council, 26
- CRAIG, Col. J., appointed Treasurer of the Household, [200]
- CRANBROOK, Earl of, value of his estate, 11
- CRAWFORD, Earl of, appointed President of the Board of Agriculture, [149], 17
- CREEDY, H. J., appointed for the preparation of statistical information, 21
- CREWE, Marquis of, in temporary charge of the Foreign Office, 7; appointed President of the Board of Education, [160], 19; at the Paris Conference, [219]
- CRICHTON, Viscount, Obit., 176
- CRIMINAL CASES.—Asseling, L. W., 20; Casement, Sir R., [139], 16; Dallas, J. M. M., 5; Jackson, T. A., 25; Montague, G. J., 20; White, Capt. J. R., 13
- CROMER, Lord, "Political and Literary Essays," 104
- CROOKES, Lady, Obit., 169
- CROSBIE, Gen. A. B., Obit., 204
- CROSBY, Alderman Sir T. B., Obit., 166
- CUNEO, C., Obit., 180
- CUNLIFFE, Brig.-Gen., at Plymouth, 11
- CUNLIFFE, Sir F. H. E., Obit., 179
- CUNNINGHAM, W., "Christianity and Politics," 102
- CURTIS, L., "The Problem of the Commonwealth," 96
- CURWEN, J. S., Obit., 182
- CURZON, Lord, Knight of the Garter, 1; mission to the King of the Belgians, 4; President of the Joint Air Board, [123]; permanent member of the War Committee, [148], [199], 17; Lord President of the Council, [199]
- CYPRUS.—BIRTH and death-rate, [298]. LOUSTS, damage from, [298]. REVENUE, [298]
- DALRYMPLE, Rt. Hon. Sir C., Obit., 175
- DALZELL, Hon. Mrs. R., Obit., 172
- DARBOUX, J. G., awarded the Sylvester Medal, 126
- D'ARCY-IRVINE, Adm. Sir St. G. C., Obit., 177
- DARWIN, Sir G. H., "Scientific Papers," 107
- DAVIES, Rev. J. L., Obit., 171
- DAWSON, C., Obit., 183
- DAWSON, H., Treitschke's "History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century," introduction by, 93

- DEATHS, number of, 131
 DECLARATION of London, order in Council repudiating, [27], [148], 17
 DEFENCE of the Realm Act, new regulations, [92], [191]; amendment, [109]
 DELAGE, Prof. Y., awarded the Darwin Medal, 126
 DEMPSTER, J., value of his estate, 23
 DENMARK.—BUDGET estimates, [291]. COPENHAGEN, Conference at, [291]. [297]. NEUTRALITY, policy of, [291]. WEST Indian Islands, sale of, [291]; referendum on, [292]
 DENISON, W. E., Obit., 139
 DEPUTATIONS received by, Asquith, H. H., [64], [107], [141], [158], 4, 10, 138; Balfour, A. J., [180]; Crewe, Lord, 125; Derby, Lord, [107]; George, D. L., [141]; Long, W., 130
 DERBY, Lord, Chairman of the Air Service Joint Committee, [75], [90]; resignation, [110], 10; appointed Under-Secretary of State for War, [149], 17; President of the Army Council, 26; Secretary for War, [199]
 DERBY scheme, result, [49]
 DERWENT, Lord, Obit., 161
 DEVONPORT, Lord, appointed Food Controller, [199], [202], [208]
 DEVONSHIRE, Duke of, Knight of the Garter, 1; appointed Governor-General of Canada, [177], [348], 16
 DEWAR, Sir J., awarded the Copley Medal, 126
 DIBBLE, G. B., "Germany's Economic Position," 94
 DICK, Rev. C. H., "Highways and Byways in Galloway and Carrick," 106
 DICKINSON, G. L., "The European Anarchy," 98-100
 DOBELL, Major-Gen. Sir C., summary of a Dispatch, describing the conquest of Cameroon, 68-70
 DOBELL, Major-Gen. G. M., at Plymouth, 11; K.C.B., conferred, 12
 DOMINGNEZ, Don V., Obit., 176
 DONNERSMARCK, Prince H. von., Obit., 204
 DONOUGHMORE, Earl of, Knight of the Order of St. Patrick, 4
 DOSTOEVSKY, F., "A Raw Youth," 120
 DOUGLAS-SCOTT-MONTAGU, Hon. R. H., Obit., 158
 DOXFORD, Sir W. T., Obit., 190
 DOYEN, E. L., Obit., 199
 DOYNE, R. W., Obit., 186
 DRAMA.—COMEDIES, 140; AMERICAN, 141; PLAYS, new, 139-141
 DRUMMOND, L. M., Obit., 161
 DU CANTÉ, Brig.-Gen. H. J., Obit., 174
 DUCKWORTH & Co., publication of, "Fondie," 119; "Twilight in Italy," 106
 DUFF, Gen. Sir B., attends the Mesopotamia Commission, 19
 DUKE, H. C., appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland, [145], [199], 18
 DUNN, Sir W., appointed Lord Mayor of London, [184], 21
 DUNRAVEN, Countess of, Obit., 139
 DUNSANY, Dow. Lady, value of her estate, 16
 DUNSANY, Lord, "Tales of Wonder," 117
 EAMES, J. B., Obit., 177
 EARDLEY-WILMOT, Capt. C., Obit. 178
 ECCLESIASTICAL.—BICKERSTETH, Rev. S., Canon of Canterbury, 21. BILBROUGH, Rev. H. E., Bishop-Suffragan of Dover, 6. CARNEGIE, Rev. W. H., Chaplain to the House of Commons, 13. Cecil, Rev. Lord W. G., Bishop of Exeter, 22. GUMBLETON, Canon M., Bishop of Ballarat, 16. LAMBERT, Rev. C. E., Vicar of All Hallows, Barking, 25. MACMILLAN, Rev. J. V., Vicar of Kew, 15. Marshall, Rev. G. K. S., Vicar of Fulham, 13. NEWSOM, Rev. G. E., Vicar of Newcastle, 25. PEAROE, Rev. Canon E. H., Archdeacon of Westminster, 14. Pierce, Canon F. D., Vicar of Brighton, 12. ROBINSON, Dr. A. W., Canon of Canterbury, 11, 25. ST. PAUL's Cathedral, memorial service, [185], 15. WARMAN, Rev. F. S. G., Vicar of Bradford, 19. Willson, Canon St. J. B. W., Dean of Bristol, 6. Woods, Rev. F. T., Bishop of Peterborough, 15
 ECHEGARAY, Don J., Obit., 188
 ECONOMIC Conference, at Paris, [186]
 ECONOMY, measures for, [64], [72], 3
 EDGE, J. H., Obit., 189
 EDUCATION, reorganisation of the system, Committees on, [154], [159], 124
 EDWARDS, Capt. H., Obit., 202
 EGERTON, Sir E. H., Obit., 177
 EGYPT.—EL ARISH, occupied, [321]. FINANCE, [321]. MILITARY Operations, [320], [321]. SENUSSI tribesmen, fighting, [320]. Sollum, captured, [320]. SUDAN Budget, [321]; Dafur, conquest of, [321]. WINGATE, Sir R., High Commissioner, [321]
 ELECTIONS.—Ayrshire, N., 21; Berwick, 19; Derby, 26; Edinburgh University, 26; Herts, E., [88], 8; Hyde, 9; Mansfield, 20; Market Harborough, [88], 9; Mile-end, 3; Newington, W., 2; St. Andrews University, 26; St. George's, Hanover Square, 2; Tewkesbury, 13; Whitechapel, 26; Wimbledon, [111], 11; Winchester, 22
 ELIOT, Hon. Mrs. C., Obit., 164
 ELKINGTON, Lieut.-Col. J. F., reinstated, 20
 ELLENBOROUGH, Lady, Obit., 194
 ELLERMAN, Sir J., acquires the shares of Wilson & Co., 22
 ELLESMERE, Dowager Lady, Obit., 200
 ELLIOTT, G., Obit., 194
 ELLIS, H., "Essays in War-Time," 100
 ENGINEERING and Shipbuilding industries, Conference at Glasgow, 18
 ERROLL, Dowager Lady, Obit., 163
 ESSEX, Earl of, Obit., 189
 ESSON, W., Obit., 185
 ESTIMATES, Army, [88], [86]; Civil Service, [78], [161]; Navy, [79], Scottish, [157]
 EUROPEAN War, The, [1]-[48]. See WAR
 EVANS, Sir A. J., President of the British Association, 126
 EVANS, Sir L. W., appointed Parliamentary Secretary of Munitions, [200]
 EVE, Sir F., Obit., 204
 EVERETT, Capt., A. F., appointed Naval Aide-de-Camp to the King, 5

- EWING, Sir J. A., appointed Principal of Edinburgh University, 13
 EXCHERQUER Bonds, 146; Post Office open for, 2
 EXPENDITURE, estimated, [100]
 EXPORTS, Amount of, 16, 149
- FARQUHAR, Lord, appointed Lord Steward of the Household, [200]
 FAUDEL-PHILLIPS, Lady, Obit., 182
 FENN, Colonel E. H., Obit., 200
 FERGUSON, Prof. J., Obit., 194
 FEVERSHAM, Lieut.-Col. the Earl of, Obit., 187
 FILIPESCU, N., Obit., 192
 FINANCE and Commerce in 1916, 145-152
 FINLAY, Sir R., appointed Lord Chancellor, [199]
 FIRES.—BERGEN, 2, 151; OTTAWA, Parliament Buildings, [346], 4; H.M. *Peel Castle*, 4
 FISHER, A., High Commissioner for Australia, 3
 FISHER, H., appointed Parliamentary Secretary of the Local Government Board, [200]
 FISHER, Dr. H. A. L., appointed President of the Board of Education, [199], [200]
 FITTON, Brig.-General H. G., Obit., 155
 FITZGERALD, Capt. Lord D., Obit., 162
 FITZGERALD, Sir M., Obit., 193
 FITZHARDINGE, Baron, Obit., 202
 FLAMMARION, publication of, "Enseignements Psychologiques de la Guerre Européenne," 100
 FLEET, British, work of the, [19]; German, failure, [20]
 FOG, in London, 26
 FOOD Controller, appointment of a, [187], [199]; increase in the price of, 23; Committee on, [171]; regulations, [187], [189], [208]
 FORBES, Lord, Obit., 157
 FORSTER, H. W., appointed Finance Secretary, of the War Office, [200]; member of the Army Council, 26
Forward, newspaper, suppression, [49]
 FRANCE.—BRIAND, M., attends Conferences in London, 2. CABINET, reorganisation, [222]. Chamber of Deputies, secret sessions, [221], [222], 15. ECONOMIC Conference, Paris, [76], [89], [98], [136], [217], [218], [355], 9, 15; resolutions, [219], [221]. FINANCE, [218]. GERMANY, peace proposals, [222]. JOFFRE, General, in London, 14; Maréchal de France, conferred, [35], 26. JOURNALISTS, in England, 4. LOAN, issue of a, [224]. MILITARY operations in the West, [1], [9], [27], [32], [34]. MINISTERS, in London, [110], 6, 14. NIVELLE, General, Com-in-Chief, [35]. POPULATION, [3]. PROFESSORS, at Cambridge, 14; at Oxford, 13. RADICAL-Socialist Congress, [222]. Ribot, M., Conference at the Treasury, 4. Rome, mission to, [225]. SOCIALIST party, views on peace proposals, [223]. Somme, battle of the, 16. VERDUN, battle of, [9], [11], 5. WAR, casualties, [3], [7], [47]; expenditure, [218], [221], [224]
 FRANCE's Day, celebrated in London, 17
- FRANCO-British Inter-Parliamentary Committee, [110], 6
 FRANKAU, Mrs., Obit., 163
 FRANKLAND, F. W., Obit., 182
 FRANKLAND-PAYNE-GALLWEY, Sir R. W., Obit., 200
 FRANKLIN, Sir G., Obit., 189
 FREMANTLE, Rev. the Hon. W. H., Obit., 206
 FRENCH, Sir E. L., Obit., 171
 FRENCH, Lord, at the Guildhall, [184]; appointed Colonel of the Irish Guards, 17; Dispatch on the Suppression of the Rebellion in Ireland, 70
 FRIAS, Duke of, Obit., 203
 FRYATT, Capt. C., taken prisoner and shot, [156]
 FULLER-ELLIOTT-DRAKE, Sir F. G. A., Obit., 181
 FURSE, Maj.-General W. T., appointed Master-General of the Ordnance, 24; member of the Army Council, 26
- GAGE, Viscountess, Obit., 164
 GALES in England, 1; London, 5; Wales, 1
 GEDDES, Brig.-General A. C., appointed Director of Recruiting, 13
 GEDDES, Sir E., appointed Director-General of Military Railways, [193], 21; Inspector-General of Transportation, 22
 GEORGE V, King, at the Star and Garter Hospital, 7; gift of money to the Treasury, 9; birthday honours, 14; attends Lord Kitchener's memorial service, [185], 15; visit to Hospitals, 17; message to the Sovereigns and Heads of Allied States, [159]; visits the Armies in France, 19; inspects the "Household Battalion," 23
 GEORGE, Rt. Hon. D. L., at the Paris Conference, [96]; mission to Ireland, [132]; proposals for the settlement, [140], 15; appointed Secretary of State for War, [149], 17; interview with an American journalist, [171], [175]; resignation, [197]; appointed Prime Minister, [198]; member of the War Cabinet, [199]; letter to members of the House of Commons, [201]; illness, [201]
 GERMANY.—AIR-RAIDS, 3, 12, 19, 20. Armed merchantmen, submarine warfare against, [327], [329], 50. *Baralong* incident, [58], [232]. Batocki, Herr von, Food Dictator, [238]. Belgium, Bryce Report on, 54-68; control of, [236]; deportations, [189]. Bethmann-Hollweg, Herr von, on the military situation, [234], [236], [240]; peace proposals, [235], [245]; on the policy of Rumania, [240]. *Brussels*, steamer, capture of, 15. Budget, [231], [234]. FALKENHAYN, General von, dismissed, [42], [243], 19. Federal constitution, change, [230]. Finance, [229], [231], [239]. FLEET, 19; failure of the, [20]. Food supply, [241]. Franchise reform, [238]. GARDELEGEN, camp at, [179]. HAASE, Herr, on the independence of Poland and Belgium, [236]. Helfferich, Dr., on the Budget, [231]; Minister of the Interior, [238]. Hindenburg, Marshal von, Chief of the General Staff, [42], [243], 19. ITALY,

GERMANY, *continued.*

war declared against, [228], 19. JAGOW, Herr von, Foreign Minister, resignation, [242]. Jutland, Battle of, [22]-[24]; losses, [24]-[26]. LOANS, issue of, [281], [239]. Louvain, sack of, 60-62. Lowestoft, bombardment, [21], [119]. MILITARY operations in the West, [1], [9], [27]-[32], [34]; in the East, [1], [14], [17], [43]-[46]; at Sea, [19]-[27], [38]. Ministers, changes in the, [238]. *Möwe*, raids, [21]. PATRIOTIC Auxiliary Service Bill, [243]-[245]. Peace overtures, [203], [209], [245]-[247]; reply of the Allies, [211]-[214]. Poland, administration, [269]-[271]. Population, [4]. Portugal, war declared against, [290], 7. "Preventive arrest," system of, [241]. Prisoners of war, exchange, [179]; number, 4; treatment, [104], [147]. Prussia, deaths, number of, [238]; Diet, opened, [232]. RUHLBEN camp, [146]. Rumania, war declared against, [240]. SEAPLANE raids, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 18, 18, 20, 22. Submarine warfare, [21], [39], [233], [330]. Switzerland, Economic convention with, [287]. TAXES, imposition, [231]. Tirpitz, Admiral von, resignation, [234], 8. Transylvania, invasion, [43]-[46]. UNITED STATES, relations with, [237]; controversy with, [325]-[333]. VERDUN, battle of, [9]-[11]. WAR, casualties, [3]-[7], [18], [48], 16, 19, 21; expenditure, [229]; origin of the, [237], [242]. Wilson, President, on the sinking of the *Sussex*, 45-49, [330]; ultimatum, [331]; reply to, 49-53, [332]. Wittenberg camp, [104]. ZEPPELIN raids, [37], 8, 7, 9, 10, 11, 18, 21, 24. Zimmermann, Herr, Foreign Minister, [242].

GILHOOLY, J. P., Obit., 192
GINNELL, L., fined, 18
GIVEN-WILSON, Rev. T., Obit., 197
Globe, The, libel action, 8
GOLTZ, Baron von der, Obit., 168
GOMME, Sir G. L., Obit., 160
GOODHEART, Sir J. F., Obit., 172
GORDON, Lieut.-Gen. B. L., Obit., 197
GORDON, Rt. Hon. J., appointed to the High Court of Ireland, 10
GORST, Sir J., Obit., 165
GOTTI, Cardinal, Obit., 164
GOUGH-CALTHORPE, Vice-Adm. the Hon. Sir S. A., appointed Lord Commissioner of the Admiralty, 14; Admiral Commanding Coast Guard and Reserves, 25
GOWER, Lord R. S., Obit., 162
GRAND, S., "The Winged Victory," 118
GRANET, Sir G., appointed Deputy Director-General of Military Railways, 22
GRANT, Adm. J. F. G., Obit., 157
GREECE.—ALLIES, encroachments, [278]; demands, [278]-[280]. Army, demobilisation, [279]; conveyed to Germany, [279]. BULGARILANS occupy Fort Rupel, [278]; treatment of the Greek army, [278]. CABINET, the new, [279]. FOURNET, Admiral de, lands a force near Athens, [280]. LAMBROS, Prof.,

Prime Minister, [279]. SALONIKA, Franco-British army at, [35], [277], 35; revolution, [279]. Sarrail, Gen. in command at Salonika, [35], [278]. Skouloudis, M., Prime Minister, [277]; resignation, [279], 15. VENIZELLOS, M., Prime Minister, dismissed, [277]; revolution, [279]; his Government at Salonika, [280]. ZAIMIS, M., Prime Minister, [279]; resignation, [279]

GREEN, Sir G., Obit., 166
GREEN, Rev. S. F., Obit., 183
GREENE, H. P., "Pilot and other Stories," 111
GREENFIELD, Brig.-Gen. R. M., Obit., 168
GREY, Sir E., at the Paris Conference, [96]; on the military situation, [177]; created Viscount, 17; memorandum to the United States, [334]-[338]
GRIFFITH-BOSCAWEN, Col. Sir A., appointed Secretary to the Ministry of Pensions, [201]
GRIMSTON, Brig.-Gen. Sir R. E., Obit., 156
GRINDLE, G. E. A., appointed Assistant Under-Secretary of State in the Colonial Office, 14
GUILDHALL, meeting, [73]
GWATKIN, Rev. H. M., Obit., 196

HAG, General Sir D., mission to the King of the Belgians, 4; G.C.V.O. conferred, 19; Order of St. Maurice conferred, 20; nominated Rector of St. Andrews University, 22
HALDANE, Dr. J. S., awarded the Royal Medal, 126
HALKETT, Lieut.-Col. H. C., Obit., 185
HALL, A. D., "Agriculture after the War," 103
HALL, Capt. W. R., appointed naval Aide-de-Camp to the King, 5
HALLEY, Capt. L., appointed Fourth Sea Lord, [196]
HAMILTON, Gen. Sir B., appointed to a Home Command, 9
HAMILTON, Vice-Adm. Sir F. T., appointed Commander-in-Chief at Rosyth, 14
HAMILTON, S. G., Obit., 184
HAMMERSHOLM, V., Obit., 158
HARCOURT, Rt. Hon. L., appointed trustee of the National Portrait Gallery, 11; in temporary charge of the Board of Trade, 13
HARDIE, W. R., Obit., 169
HARDINGE, Lord, return to England, 11; Report on the Irish Rebellion, 78-88
HARIGNIES, H. J., Obit., 185
HARRIS, Rt. Hon. F. L., appointed Secretary to the Ministry of Blockade, [201]
HARRISON, C. A., Obit., 194
HARRISON, Mrs. F., Obit., 173
HART, H. H., Obit., 191
HAWLEY, S., Obit., 174
HAY, Sir H. M., Obit., 188
HAY, Adm. the Rt. Hon. Lord J., Obit., 169
HEALY, M. T., "Pathological Lying. Accusation and Swindling," 108
HEALY, W., "The Individual Delinquent," 109; "Pathological Lying, Accusation, and Swindling," 108
HEATH, Maj.-Gen. C. E., appointed Deputy Quartermaster-General, 8

- HEAVEN, Rev. H. G., Obit., 161
- HEINEMANN, W., publication of, "Germany's Economic Position," 94; "The Individual Delinquent," 109; "Pathological Lying, Accusation, and Swindling," 108; "A Raw Youth," 120; "The Winged Victory," 118
- HENDERSON, Rt. Hon. A., President of the Board of Education, resignation, [160], 18; appointed Paymaster-General, [160], 19; member of the War Cabinet, [199], [200]
- HENDERSON, Maj.-Gen. Sir D., member of the Army Council, 26
- HERBERT, Sir J., Obit., 206
- HERSCHELL, Lord, appointed Lord-in-Waiting, [201]
- HEWART, G., appointed Solicitor-General, [199]
- HEWETT, W. T. S., Obit., 178
- HEWITT, Sir F. W., Obit., 153
- HEYWORTH, Brig.-Gen. F. J., Obit., 170
- HILDYARD, Gen. Sir H. J. T., Obit., 181
- HILL, J. J., Obit., 172
- HOBHOUSE, Sir C. P., Obit., 207
- HODDER & Stoughton, publication of, "At the War," 97; "David Blaize," 113
- HODGE, J., appointed Minister of Labour, [199], [200]
- HOLMES, C. J., appointed Director of the National Gallery, 17, 134
- HOLMES, Rt. Hon. H., Obit., 167
- HOLROYD, Sir C., Director of the National Gallery, retirement, 134
- HOLROYD, Sir E., Obit., 160
- HOLZAPFEL, A. G., appointed British Vice-Consul at Rotterdam, [166]; resignation, [167]
- HOME Civil Service, scheme for reforming, 24
- HOPE, J. F., appointed Lord of the Treasury, [201]
- HOPKINS, A. A., Obit., 177
- HOPKINS, Adm. Sir J. O., Obit., 181
- HORNER, A. L., Obit., 155
- HORSLEY, Sir V., Obit., 179
- "HOUSEHOLD Battalion," formed, 23
- HOWARD, Sir H., G.C.M.G., conferred, 19
- HOWARD, Sir S., Obit., 166
- HOWELL, Brig.-Gen. P., Obit., 192
- HUERTA, Gen., Obit., 154
- HUGHES, Mrs. M., Obit., 177
- HUGHES, Rt. Hon. W. M., Prime Minister of Australia, takes part in a Cabinet meeting at Ottawa, 5; in England, [355], 7; appointed Privy Councillor, 8; attends a Cabinet meeting, [89]; at the British Imperial Council of Commerce, [89]; the Pilgrims' Club, [90]; City Carlton Club, [90]; freedom of the City of London, conferred, [90], [103]; at the Paris Conference, [102], [219], [355]; at the House of Commons, [103]; Glasgow, [104]; the Ritz Hotel, 15; return to Australia, [187]
- HUMPHRY, A. P., Obit., 191
- HUNTER, Col. C., Obit., 160
- HYDE Park, demonstration, [166]
- HYLTON, Lord, appointed Lord-in-Waiting, [201]
- ILLINGWORTH, A., appointed Postmaster-General, [199]
- IMMELMANN, Obit., 175
- IMPERIAL Conference, proposed, [205]
- IMPORTS, amount of, 16, 149
- INCOME Tax, increase, [97], [99]
- INDIA.—BUDGET, [300]. CEYLON, [305]. Chelmsford, Lord, Viceroy, [302], 2; at Bombay, [302]; at the opening of the Legislative Council, [303]. HARDING, Mr., stabbed, 6. HARDINGE, Lord, review of the past year, [302]. INDENTURED Labour, system of, abolished, [302]. Indian Progressives, memorandum, [305]. MOHAMMADS, raid, [305]. Munro, Lieut.-Gen. Sir C. C., Commander-in-Chief, 19. RONALDS-HAY, Earl of, Governor of Bengal, 24. TERRITORIALS, deaths from heat-stroke, [303]. WHEAT, price of, [301]
- INTER-Parliamentary Committee, British, members at the French Foreign Office, 6
- IRELAND.—CAMPBELL, J. H., Lord Chief Justice, 24, 25. DUBLIN, Gaelic Press offices, raided, 9; rebellion, [118]-[120]. Duke, H. C., Chief Secretary, [199], 18. GOVERNMENT, proposals, [140], [142]. MARTIAL Law, proclaimed, [119]. O'BRIEN, Sir I., Lord Chancellor, [199]. POPULATION, [3]. REBELLION, [118]-[120], 11, 12; leaders shot, [121], [122]; casualties, [122]; suppression, 70-78; report of the Royal Commission, 78-88, [128], [138]. SINN-Fein rebellion, [118]; proclamation, [120]. Skeffington, S., case of, [175]. ULSTER Nationalists Convention, 15; Unionist Council, meeting, [140]. WIMBORNE, Lord, Lord Lieutenant, [199], 18
- ISLINGTON, Lord, appointed Under-Secretary of India, [200]
- ISMAY, J. B., Director of the Mercantile Marine Committee, resignation, 16
- ITALY.—ASQUITH, H. H., in Rome, [226]. Austria-Hungary, military operations against, [11]-[13], [32]-[35]. BOSELLI, Signor, Prime Minister, [227]. Budget, [226]. CABINET, resign, [227]; the new, [227]. Cadorna, General, Commander-in-Chief, [12], [226]; in London, 8; received by the King, 9. FINANCE, [226]. French Ministers, mission to Rome, [225]. GERMANY, war declared against, [228], 19. Gorizia, captured, [32]-[34]. IRREDENTISM, [276]. PARLIAMENT, opened, [225]. Population, [3]. SALANDRA, Signor, on the military situation, [227]; registration, [227]. Summer Time, 14. WAR, casualties, [6]; expenditure, [226], [232]
- IVEAGH, Viscountess, Obit., 159
- JACKS, L. P., "Mad Shepherds," "From the Human End," "Philosophers in Trouble," 107
- JACKSON, C. S., Obit., 193
- JACKSON, Adm. Sir H., appointed President of the Royal Naval College, Greenwich, [196]
- JACKSON, Sir K. G., Obit., 187
- JACOBS, Prof. J., Obit., 157
- JAMES, H., Order of Merit, conferred 1; Obit., 161

- JAPAN.—CABINET, the new, [810]. China, relations with, [810]. Crown Prince, ceremony of "installing," [811]. KEN-SHIKAI party, [811]. OKUMA, Count, resignation, [810]. Ozama, Prince, death, [811]. 204. RUSSIA, treaty with, [809]. TERAUCHI, Marshal, Prime Minister, [810]; foreign policy, [810]
- JARROLD & Sons, G., Allen & Unwin, publication of, "Treitschke's History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century," 93
- JELICOE, Adm. Sir J., appointed First Sea Lord, [39], [196]
- JERVOISE, Sir E. J. C., Obit., 170
- JONES, Capt. H. M., Obit., 206
- JONES-VAUGHAN, Maj.-Gen., H. T., Obit., 166
- JUDD, Prof. J. W., Obit., 162
- JUTLAND, battle of, [22]-[24], 13; British losses, [26]
- KAMIMURA, Adm. Baron H., Obit., 183
- KEBLING, Rev. W. H., Obit., 165
- KELLAWAY, F. G., appointed Parliamentary Secretary of Munitions, [200]
- KELVIN, Lady, Obit., 163
- KENNEDY, Brig.-Gen., C. H., Obit., 196
- KENNEDY, Adm. Sir W. R., Obit., 191
- KENT, restrictions in the sale of liquor, 17, 18
- KENYON, Lord, appointed Lord-in-Waiting, [201]
- KERR, Maj.-Gen. Lord R. D., Obit., 188
- KIDD, B., Obit., 190
- KING, J., fined, 22
- KINNOULL, Earl of, Obit., 158
- KINTORE, Dowager Countess, Obit., 158
- KIRKALDY, Prof. A. W., on reconstruction after the war, 127
- KIRKPATRICK, Rev. R. C., Obit., 156
- KITCHENER, Lord, at the Guildhall, [78]; the Paris Conference, [96]; drowned, [185], 14; memorial services, [185], 15; sale of a letter, 16; value of his estate, 16; Obit., 172
- KNIGHT, W. A., Obit., 162
- KNIGHTHOODS conferred, Benson, F. R., 12; Fletcher, Dr. L., 1
- KNOX, Maj.-Gen. Sir W. G., Obit., 204
- KOETTLITZ, Dr. R., Obit., 154
- KRUPPS Munition Works, dividend, 24
- KUNWAR, Sir R. S., Obit., 155
- KYLIE, Prof. E. J., Obit., 170
- LABOUR disputes, [191]
— party, conferences, [52], [57], 11
- LAKE, Gen., Commander-in-Chief in Mesopotamia, [274]
- LAMBERT, H. C. M., appointed Assistant Under-Secretary of State in the Colonial Office, 14; Secretary to the Imperial Conference, 14
- LAMBERT, Sir J., Obit., 186
- LANCASHIRE, restriction in the sale of liquor, 4
- LANE, J., publication of, "Essays and Literary Studies," 104; "Far-Away Stories," 117
- LANG, Col. A. M., Obit., 182
- LANKESTER, Sir R., protest against the neglect of science, 12
- LARGEAU, Gen., Obit., 164
- LAUBIE, T. W., publication of, "The Brook Kerith," 120
- LAW, Rt. Hon. B., at the Association of Chambers of Commerce, [76]; at Queen's Hall, [159]; on the origin of the Coalition Government, [160]; fails to form an Administration, [197]; at the Paris Conference, [219]
- LAWRENOR, D. H., "Twilight in Italy," 106
- LAWRENCE, Lady, Obit., 164
- LEACOCK, S., "Essays and Literary Studies," 104
- LEE, Col. A., K.C.B., conferred, 17
- LEE, S., Obit., 138
- LEIGH, E. C. A., Obit., 165
- LE MESSURIER, Col. A., Obit., 160
- LEROY-BEAULIEU, P. P., Obit., 203
- LESLIE, Sir J., Obit., 155
- LEVETT, E. L., Obit., 191
- LEWIS, H., appointed Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education, [200]
- LEY, Sir F., Obit., 155
- LIBERAL War Committee, resolutions, [87]
- LIGHTING Orders in London, increased stringency, 8
- LINCOLN, T. T., escape, 2; recaptured, 5; committed for trial, 15
- LINTON, Sir J., Obit., 138
- LINTON, Sir J. D., Obit., 191
- LIQUOR, restriction in the sale of, 4, 17
- LITERATURE.—Retrospect of, 89; Fiction, 111-122; General Literature, 91-111
- LLANGATTOCK, Lord, value of his estate, 24; Obit., 194
- LOCKE, W. J., "Far-Away-Stories," 117
- LODGE, Sir O. J., "Raymond or Life and Death," 110
- LONDON, Anzac Day, celebration of, 11
— Belgium's Day, celebration of, 17
— Cabs, whistling for, at nights, prohibited, 19
— Clocks, public, discontinue chimes and striking, 3
— County Council, reduction of rates, 11
— Fog in, 26
— France's Day, celebration of, 17
— Lighting Orders, increased stringency, 8
— Lord Mayor's Day, celebration, 23
- LONDON, J., "The Little Lady of the Big House," 115; Obit., 199
- LONG, Maj.-Gen. S. S., Director of Supplies and Transport, resignation, 7
- LONG, Rt. Hon. W., appointed Colonial Secretary, [199]
- LONGFORD, Brig.-Gen. the Earl of, Obit., 175
- LONGMANS, Green & Co., publication of, "British Birds," 91; "Italy in the War," 97; "The Spirit of Man," 105; "Tales of the Great War," 98
- LOVELL, Sir F. H., Obit., 156
- LOW, S., "Italy in the War," 97; Obit., 188
- LOWESTOFT, bombarded by German warships, [21], [119], 11
- LOWTHEB, Sir G. A., Obit., 165
- LUBBOCK, A., Obit., 179
- LUCAS, Capt. Lord, Obit., 201
- LUCK, Gen. Sir G., Obit., 203
- LUPTON, A., fined, 23

- LÜTZOW, Count, Obit., 154
 LUXEMBURG, Grand Duchy of.—GERMAN administration, [283]. VAN-
 NERUS, Herr, Prime Minister, [284]
 LYALL, Sir J. B., Obit., 201
 LYTTLETON, Dr. E., head master of Eton,
 resignation, 10
 LYTTON, Earl of, Civil Lord of the Admir-
 alty, 18
- MACCUNN, H., Obit., 182
 MACDONALD, Prof. H. M., awarded the
 Royal Medal, 126
 MACFARLANE, P. C., Obit., 200
 MACFARLANE, P. C., "Held to Answer,"
 117
 MACGEOUGH-BOND-SHELTON, Capt. R.,
 Obit., 162
 MACKINNON, Gen. Sir H., appointed Direc-
 tor of Recruiting, 6
 MACLAY, Sir J., appointed Shipping Con-
 troller, [199], [202], 150
 MACLEAN, Dr. C. D., Obit., 175
 MACMILLAN & Co., publication of, "High-
 ways and Byways in Galloway and
 Carrick," 106; "In Far North-East
 Siberia," 109; "Pilot and other
 Stories," 111; "Political and Literary
 Essays," 104; "The Problem of the
 Commonwealth," 96
 MACNAMARA, Dr. T. J., appointed Parlia-
 mentary Secretary of the Admiralty,
 [200]
 MACNAUGHTAN, S., Obit., 181
 MACPHERSON, J. I., member of the Army
 Council, 26; appointed Under-Secretary
 of the War Office, [200]
 MACRAY, Rev. W. D., Obit., 202
 MACREADY, Lieut.-Gen. Sir C. F. N., ap-
 pointed Adjutant-General to the Forces,
 8; member of the Army Council, 26
 MADHAYAL, Sir C., Obit., 164
 MAHON, Lieut.-Gen. Sir B., Commander-in-
 Chief in Ireland, 23; in command of
 the troops at Salonika, 34-36
 MANCHESTER, Chamber of Commerce,
 meeting, [65], 5
 MAN-POWER Distribution Board, work of
 the, [170]; report, [181]
 MANSFIELD, Deputy Surgeon-General C. J.,
 Obit., 170
 MARKHAM, Sir A., value of his estate, 23;
 Obit., 182
 MARKHAM, Sir C., Obit., 156
 MARKS, H. H., Obit., 205
 MAROCHETTI, Baron, Obit., 203
 MARRIAGES.—Armin, Countess von, 10;
 Arnott, V., 6; Battenberg, Prince G.
 of, 23; Freyre, Lord de, 6; Granby,
 Marq. of, 3; Russell, Lord, 10; Ten-
 nant, K., 3; Torby, Countess N., 23
 MARRIED men, attested, demand for univer-
 sal compulsion, [78], [88]; called up,
 7, 12; civil obligations, [106]; de-
 putations from, [107], 10; report for
 service, 10; last day of voluntary re-
 cruiting, 14
 MARSHALL, Lady, Obit., 163
 MARTIN, Sir G., Obit., 160
 MARTIN, Sir R. B., Obit., 185
 MARY, Queen, at the Star and Garter Hos-
 pital, 7; attends Lord Kitchener's
 memorial service, [185], 15; at the
 opening of the Hospital for Women,
 16; at the Hospitals at Epsom, 17
 MASPERO, Sir G., Obit., 176
 MASSEY, Rt. Hon. W. F., LL.D., conferred,
 23
 MATTHEWS, Elkin, publication of, "Tales
 of Wonder," 117
 MAUNSELL, Gen. Sir F. R., Obit., 194
 MAXIM, Sir H. S., Obit., 200
 MAXWELL, Gen. Sir J., in command in
 Ireland, [119]; return to England, 9;
 Dispatch on the Suppression of the
 Rebellion in Ireland, 71-73
 MCCARDIE, H. A., appointed Judge of the
 High Court of Justice, 21
 MCKENNA, Rt. Hon. R., at the Guildhall,
 [73]; the Association of Chambers of
 Commerce, [76]
 MCKERRELL, Brigade Commander A. de S.,
 Obit., 168
 MCNEILL, B., Obit., 189
 MEALS, regulation of, 25
 MEDICAL Board, Central, established, 21
 MELLISH, Rev. E. M., awarded the V.C.,
 11
 MERCANTILE tonnage, Committee for the
 control of, [68]
 MERCER, Brig.-Gen. D., appointed Adju-
 tant-General of the Royal Marine
 forces, 16
 MERCIER, A., Obit., 204
 MEREDITH, Rt. Hon. R. J., Obit., 156
 MERSEY, Lord, created Viscount, 1
 MERSID-EL-AAZAM, Sir I., Obit., 160
 METCHNIKOFF, Prof. E., awarded the
 Albert Medal, 16; Obit., 178
 METHUEN & Co., publication of, "Raymond
 or Life and Death," 110; "These
 Twain," 116
 MEXBOROUGH, Earl of, Obit., 174
 MEXICO.—CARRANZA, General, President
 of the Republic, [350]. PERSHING,
 Gen., withdrawal of his force, [351].
 UNITED STATES, relations with, [350].
 VILLA, Gen., depredations, [350]
 MILDMAI, Maj., Sir H. P. St. J., Obit.,
 168
 MILITARY Service Act, commencement, 3;
 Single men called up, 4, 5; in operation,
 [194], 7; married men called up, 7,
 10, 12
 MILLS & Boon, publication of, "The Little
 Lady of the Big House," 115
 MILNER, J. D., appointed Director of the
 National Portrait Gallery, 13, 184
 MILNER, Lord, appointed member of the
 War Cabinet, [199]
 MILVAIN, Sir T., Obit., 189
 MOLTKE, H. von, Obit., 174
 MOND, Sir A., appointed First Commissioner
 of Works, [199]
 MONEY, Sir L. G. C., appointed Secretary
 to the Shipping Controller, [201]
 MONRO, Gen. Sir C., appointed Comman-
 der-in-Chief in India, 19; dispatch
 on the withdrawal of troops from
 Gallipoli and the landing of troops at
 Salonika, 39-41
 MONTAGU, Rt. Hon. E. S., appointed Chan-
 cellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, 2;
 Minister of Munitions, [149], 17
 MONTAGU, General Sir H., Obit., 196

- MONTAGU, Lord, at Birmingham, [110]; resigns seat on the Joint Air Committee, 10
- MONTENEGRO.—CETTYGNE, capitulates, [281]. 2. LOVTOHEN, Mount, bombardment, [281]
- Nicholas, King of, flight to France, [281]
- MONTROSE, Duke of, appointed Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 12
- MOORE, Rev. Dr. E., Obit., 186
- MOORE, G., "The Brook Kerith," 120-122
- MOORE, Sir J. S., Obit., 199
- MORGAN, J. P., sale of tapestries, 10
- MORGAN, Alderman Sir W. V., Obit., 196
- MORISON, T. B., appointed Solicitor-General for Scotland, [199]
- MORRIS, Sir E., entertained by the West India Club, 20
- MORRIS, H. P., appointed Second Commissioner to the Charity Commission, 7
- MORRISON, Brig.-Gen. C. G., Obit., 171
- MOSEY, Col. J., Obit., 172
- MOTOR cars, appeal against the use of, for pleasure, 5
- MOUNT-SULLY, M., Obit., 162
- MOWBRAY, Sir R. A., Obit., 207
- MOWBRAY, Sir R. G. C., Obit., 180
- Möwe*, raids, [21]
- MUDFORD, W. H., Obit., 192
- MUIR-MACKENZIE, Sir J. W. P., Obit., 194
- MÜLLER, Mrs. M., Obit., 179
- MULLINS, Major C. H., Obit., 171
- MUNRO, Rt. Hon. R., appointed Secretary for Scotland, [199]
- MÜNSTERBERG, Prof. H., Obit., 204
- MURRAY, Gen. Sir A., in command of the forces in Egypt, 9
- MURRAY, J., Obit., 169
- MURRAY, J., publication of, "Agriculture After the War," 103; "Aristodemocracy," 101; "Christianity and Politics," 102; "Mrs. Balfame," 114
- MURRAY, Lieut.-Gen. Sir J. W., appointed General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, 13
- MURRAY, Lord, Director-General of Munitions Recruiting, resignation, 5
- MUSEUMS and galleries, decision to close, [64], [72], 3, 136; protest against, 4, 136
- MUSIC.—Retrospect of: BALLAD Concerts, 143. CHAMBER Concerts, 144. ELGAR Festival, 143. LONDON String Quartet, 143. LONDON Symphony Orchestra, 143. New Queen's Hall Symphony Concerts, 143. OPERAS, 141. PROMENADE Concerts, 143. RECITALS, 143. ROYAL Albert Hall, Concerts, 143. ROYAL Philharmonic Society, 142
- NAPIER, Dr. A. S., Obit., 170
- NASH, E., publication of, "Held to Answer," 117
- NATIONAL Portrait Gallery, appointment of trustees, 11
- Service, Director-General, appointed, [205]
- NAVAL and Military Air Service Joint Committee, [67], [75], [90]
- NAVY, British, work of the, [19]; losses at the Battle of Jutland, [28]
- NEILSON, F., resigns his seat in Parliament, 7
- NETHERLANDS, THE.—FLOODS, [284]. GREAT Britain, relations with, [284]. HOLZAPPEL, A. G., Vice-Consul at Rotterdam, [166]; resignation, [167]. MAILS, seizure of, [285]. NEUTRALITY, policy of, [284]. SUBMARINES, losses from, [285]. ZUIDER Zee, proposal to reclaim, [285]
- NEUMANN, Sir S., Obit., 187
- NEW Middlesex Theatre, renewal of licence, refused, 24
- NEW ZEALAND.—EXPEDITIONARY Force Reserve Bill, [359]. LOAN, issue of a, [359]. VOLUNTEERS, number of, [358]
- NEWBOLT, Sir H., "Tales of the Great War," 98
- NEWBOROUGH, Baron, Obit., 179
- NEWFOUNDLAND.—ALCOHOL, prohibition, [349]. SEALS, restrictions on killing, [349]
- NEWS Service, The International, case of, 21
- NEWSPAPER Proprietors' Association, entertain French journalists, 4; Russian journalists, 6
- NEWTON, Lord, in charge of certain departments of the Foreign Office, 7; appointed Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, [160], 19
- NICHOLSON, Capt. G. C. N., Obit., 163
- NICOL, Prof. T., Obit., 183
- NISBET, Col. R. P., Obit., 173
- NIXON, Gen., Commander-in-Chief in Mesopotamia, [274]; superseded, [274]
- NOBLE, Sir A., value of his estate, 2
- NORTHCLIFFE, Lord, entertained by the Foreign Press Association, 15; "At the War," 97
- NORWAY.—BUDGET, [297]. CHRISTIANIA, conference at, [297]. Constitution, reform, [297]. Copenhagen, Conference at, [297]. NEUTRALITY, policy of, [296]. SUBMARINES, German, losses from, [297]
- NORWOOD, C., appointed Master of Marlborough College, 17
- NUTTALL, Most Rev. E., Obit., 172
- OBITUARY, 153-207; see under separate names
- O'BRIEN, Sir I., appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland, [199]
- O'CONNOR, T. P., appointed President of the Trade Board of Film Censors, 25
- O'DONNELL, F. H., Obit., 195
- O'KELLY, J. J., Obit., 205
- OLDHAM, W. J. Obit., 192
- OLIVER, D., Obit., 205
- ONSLLOW, Sir W., Obit., 154
- "OUR DAY," amount of collections, 22
- OXFORD University, Slade Professorship suspended, 138
- OYAMA, Prince I., Obit., [811], 204
- PAGET, Gen. Sir A., appointed to a Home Command, 9
- PALMER, Capt. the Hon. R. S. A., Obit., 163
- PAPER-making materials, importation prohibited, [68], 5; Commission appointed, [88], 5

- PARLIAMENT. — Prorogued, [64], 3; King's Speech, [64], [65]; opened, [65], [135], [137], 5; Whitsuntide recess, [134]; adjourned, [165]; re-assembled, [172], 21
- AGRICULTURE, Board of, vote, [133]
- CABINET, leakage of secrets, [109]; changes in the, [149], [159]; War, members, [199]
- COLONIAL Office Vote, [156]
- CREDIT, Votes of, [71], [127], [154], [174], [207]
- MINISTERS, payment of salaries, [72], 6
- MINISTRIES, new, established, [201]
- MINISTRY, fall of, [187]; the new, [199]
- Post Office Vote, [149]
- SECRET Session, [109], [111]
- SUPPLY, Committee of, [71], [161]
- PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES. —
- ADMINISTRATION, the late, Asquith, H. H., [205]; Curzon Lord, [206]
- AFRICA, German East, Law, B., [156]
- AIR Board, Joint, Crewe, Lord, [125]; Curzon, Lord, [128]; Galway, Lord, [128]; Montagu, Lord, [81], [125], [126]; Northcliffe, Lord, [125]; Tennant, H. J., [123]
- AIR Service, Balfour, A. J., [67]; Bennett Goldney, Capt. F., [92]; Billing, P., [84], [91], [125], [158]; Cecil, Lord, H., [124]; Churchill, W., [124]; Derby, Lord, [90]; Griffith, E., [91]; Haldane, Lord, [82]; Harmsworth, C. B., [67]; Joynson-Hicks, W., [66], [90], [123]; Lansdowne, Lord, [82]; Law, B., [124]; Mond, Sir A., [92]; Montagu, Lord, [81], [125]; Tennant, H. J., [67], [83], [91], [92], [124]
- AMERICAN Securities, McKenna, R., [128]
- ARMY Estimates, Tennant, H. J., [83]
- organisation, Churchill, W., [134]; McKenna, R., [134]
- pensions, Forster, H. W., [84]; Tennant, H. J., [83]
- AUGUST Bank holiday postponed, Asquith, H. H., [156]
- AUSTRALIA, drafts of men from, George, D. L., [157]
- BELGIANS, deportation of, Cecil, Lord R., [189]
- BELGIUM, reinstatement of, Grey, Sir E., [87]
- BUDGET, Hewins, W. A. S., [101]; McKenna, R., [97]; Mond, Sir A., [101]
- CABINET secrets, disclosure of, Buckmaster, Lord, [117]; Burnham, Lord, [117]; Dalziel, Sir H., [117]; Hewart, G., [118]; Parmour, Lord, [117]; Salter, A. O., [118]; Samuel, H., [118]
- CARDIFF, peace conference, Herbert, Sir I., [185]; MacDonald, R., [185]; Samuel, H., [185]; Stanton, C. E., [185]; Thomas, J. H., [185]
- CLYDE strike, Addison, Dr., [94], [95]; George, D. L., [95]
- COCOA, duty on, McKenna, R., [137]
- export of, Lansdowne, Lord, [62]; Sydenham, Lord, [61]
- COMPULSORY military service, Crewe, Lord, [108]; Milner, Lord, [108]; Salisbury, Lord, [108]
- CONTRABANDS, list of, Cecil, Lord R., [96]
- CREDIT, votes of, Asquith, H. H., [71], [127], [154], [174]; Law, B., [207]; McKenna, R., [207]
- DARDANELLES Commission, Cromer, Lord, [161]
- DAYLIGHT Saving Bill, Norman, Sir H., [122]; Samuel, H., [122]
- DECLARATION of London, Cecil, Lord R., [148]
- DEFENCE of the Realm Act, Smith, Sir F. E., [93]; Trevelyan, C. P., [92]
- DOLLAR Securities, impost on, McKenna, R., [138]
- DRINK restrictions, Astor, Maj., [180]; Gretton, Col., [180]; Montagu, E. S., [180]
- EDUCATION, reorganisation, Crewe, Lord, [154]; Cromer, Lord, [153]; Curzon, Lord, [153]; Henderson, A., [153]
- ELECTION, General, proposed Committee on, Asquith, H. H., [153]; Carson, Sir E., [153]; Samuel, H., [152]
- FINANCE Bill, Chamberlain, A., [126]; Lough, T., [138]; McKenna, R., [127], [137], [153]; Mond, Sir A., [138]; Montagu, E. S., [102], [138]; Newman, Maj., [102]; O'Connor, T. P., [101]; Stanley, A., [101]
- FOOD, prices of, Acland, F. D., [165]; Anderson, W. C., [172]; Barnes, G. N., [172]; Pretymann, E. G., [165]; Runciman, W., [173]
- supplies, Acland, F. D., [183]; Churchill, W., [188]; Crawford, Lord, [189]; Devonport, Lord, [209]; Dunraven, Lord, [189]; Prothero, R. E., [184], [209]; Runciman, W., [187], [188]; Simon, Sir J., [188]
- Forward, suppression of, Anderson, W. C., [50]; George, D. L., [50]; Pringle, W. M. R., [50]; Tennant, H. J., [50]; Thomas, J. H., [49]
- FRYATT, Capt., murder of, Asquith, H. H., [156]
- GEDDES, Sir E., appointment of, Derby, Lord, [193]
- GERMAN mission to Afghanistan, Chamberlain, A., [192]
- prisoners, employment of, Hope, J., [189]
- GERMANY, blockade of, Bunn, S., [62]; Beresford, Lord, [70]; Crewe, Lord, [70]; Devonport, Lord, [63]; Devonshire, Duke of, [63]; Grey, Sir E., [63]; Lansdowne, Lord, [70]; Scott, L., [62]; Sydenham, Lord, [70]
- economic war on, Chaplin, H., [60]; Hewins, W. A. S., [59]; Prothero, R. E., [60]; Runciman, W., [60]
- GOVERNMENT, policy of, Crewe, Lord, [206]; George, D. L., [204]
- GUNS, construction of anti-aircraft, Asquith, H. H., [75]
- HAG, Sir D., and the Army Council, Derby, Lord, [193]
- IRELAND, administration of, Asquith, H. H., [181], [142], [144], [145], [176]; Beresford, Lord, [129]; Carson, Sir E., [144]; Crewe, Lord, [129]; Cromer, Lord, [130]; Devlin, J., [176]; Dillon, J., [182], [145]; Duke, H. O., [176];

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

- George, D. L., [144]; Halsbury, Lord, [130]; Lansdowne, Lord, [129], [141], [143]; Law, B., [146], [208]; Loreburn, Lord, [128]; M'Calmont, Col., [208]; Middleton, Lord, [129], [143]; Redmond, J., [144], [145], [175]; Redmond, Maj. W., [207]; Salisbury, Lord, [130]; Selborne, Lord, [141]; Wimborne, Lord, [143]
- rebellion in, Birrell, A., [121]; Butcher, J. G., [119]; Carson, Sir E., [119], [122]; Redmond, J., [119], [122]
- rebels, execution of, Asquith, H. H., [130], [131]; Dillon, J., [131]
- recruiting in, George, D. L., [177]
- KITCHENER, Lord, reduction of salary, Asquith, H. H., [134]; Herbert, Maj.-Gen. Sir I., [134]
- KITCHENER, Lord, tribute to, Asquith, H. H., [135]; French, Lord, [135]
- KUT, prisoners at, Cecil, Lord R., [159]
- MARRIED men, attested, Carson, Sir E., [106]; Derby, Lord, [85]; Glyn-Jones, W. S., [86]; Kitchener, Lord, [85]; Long, W., [105]; Simon, Sir J., [86]
- MEN, reservoirs of, Churchill, W., [127]
- MERCANTILE tonnage, control, Houston, R. P., [68]; Peto, B. E., [68]; Runciman, W., [68], [69]
- MESOPOTAMIA, operations, Asquith, H. H., [150]; Beresford, Lord, [93]; Carson, Sir E., [149], [150]; Chamberlain, A., [152]; Crewe, Lord, [94]; George, D. L., [151]; Islington, Lord, [93]
- MILITARY Service Bill, Anderson, W. C., [53]; Asquith, H. H., [51], [53], [112], [113]; Balfour, A. J., [52]; Banbury, Sir F., [115]; Carson, Sir E., [53], [112], [113], [114]; Cecil, Lord H., [115]; Chambers, J., [54]; Craig, C., [55]; Derby, Lord, [56]; Duke, H. C., [112]; George, D. L., [114], [173], [174]; Harvey, E., [55], [115]; Henderson, A., [53], [114]; Herbert, Sir I., [54]; Hodge, J., [52]; Holt, R. D., [52], [113]; Joynson-Hicks, W., [55]; Lambert, R. C., [53]; Lansdowne, Lord, [56], [116]; Law, B., [52], [54], [55], [56]; Long, W., [53], [54], [85], [86], [87], [112], [115]; Lonsdale, Sir J., [114]; Middleton, Lord, [56]; Mildmay, F. B., [56]; O'Brien, W., [52]; Bray, Lord, [116]; Redmond, J., [52], [53], [114]; Robertson, J. M., [52]; Seely, Gen. [52]; Simon, Sir J., [51], [53], [54], [114]; Snowden, P., [53], [55]; Thomas, J. H., [52], [56]; Walsh, S., [112]; Ward, J., [52]; Weardale, Lord, [56]; Yate, Col., [55]
- Service, exemptions, Derby, Lord, [77]; George, D. L., [79]
- grievances, Long, W., [76]; Simon, Sir J., [76]; Tennant, H. J., [75], [76]
- situation, Asquith, H. H., [66]; George, D. L., [165], [204]; Kitchener, Lord, [66]
- MINISTRIES Bill, Cave, Sir G., [202]
- MUNITIONS of War Bill, George, D. L., [50]; Montagu, E. S., [164]; Pringle, W. M. R., [50]
- NATIONAL Gallery Bill, Curzon, Lord, [191], 135; D'Abernon, Lord, [190] 135; Lansdowne, Lord, [191]; Weardale, Lord, [191]
- NAVAL policy, Beresford, Lord, [192]; Crewe, Lord, [192]; Sydenham, Lord, [192]
- Estimates, Balfour, A. J., [79], [80]; Churchill, W., [80]
- NIGERIA, sale of enemy properties, Carson, Sir E., [182]; Law, B., [182]; Scott, L., [182]; Steel-Maitland, R., [182]
- NORTHOLIFFE, Lord, charge against, Dalziel, Sir H., [190]; George, D. L., [190]; Outhwaite, R. L., [190]
- PAPER, reduction in the importation, Runciman, W., [68]
- PARIS Conference, Asquith, H. H., [157]; Bryce, Lord, [103]; Courtney, Lord, [103]; Crewe, Lord, [103]; Law, B., [158]; Simon, Sir J., [158]
- PARLIAMENT Bill, Middleton, Lord, [164]; Parmoor, Lord, [164]; Peel, Lord, [164]
- and Local Elections Bill, Asquith, H. H., [163]; Carson, Sir E., [163]
- Register and Elections Bill, Crewe, Lord, [183]; Lansdowne, Lord, [183]; Parmoor, Lord, [183]; Salisbury, Lord, [183]
- PEACE, negotiations, Asquith, H. H., [74]; Cecil, Lord R., [193]; George, D. L., [204], [210]; Grey, Sir E., [133]; Law, B., [192]; M'Neill, R., [192]; Ponsonby, A., [132]; Snowden, P., [74]; Trevelyan, C. P., [74]
- PENSIONS Bill, Griffith, E., [186]; Henderson, A., [185], [186]; Hogge, J. M., [186]
- supplementary, Fisher, H., [160]; Hogge, J. M., [160]; Wardle, G. J., [160]
- Post Office statistics, Pease, J. A., [149]
- PRESS, information given to the, Asquith, H. H., [183]; Carson, Sir E., [184]; Dalziel, Sir H., [183]
- PRISONERS, exchange of, Newton, Lord, [179]
- treatment in Germany, Cecil, Lord R., [147]; Devonport, Lord, [147], [148]; Grey, Sir E., [147]
- RECRUITING, statement on, Asquith, H. H., [108]; Carson, Sir E., [108]; Lansdowne, Lord, [109]
- REGISTRATION Bill, Asquith, H. H., [162], [163]; Carson, Sir E., [162], [163]; Churchill, W., [163]; Curzon, Lord, [61]; St. Aldwyn, Lord, [61]
- of Business Names Bill, Carson, Sir E., [181]
- SALARIES of Members, Banbury, Sir F., [97]; Duke, H. C., [97]; Law, B., [97]; McKenna, R., [97]
- SPECIAL Register Bill, Asquith, H. H., [188]; Carson, Sir E., [188]
- TRIBUNALS, exemptions, Derby, Lord, [76]; Harris, Lord, [77]; Lansdowne, Lord, [78]; Long, W., [86]; Selborne, Lord, [77]
- VOLUNTEER Bill, Derby, Lord, [195]; French, Lord, [195]

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

- WAR, expenditure, Asquith, H. H., [65], [71], [127], [154], [174]; Carson, Sir E., [153]; McKenna, R., [72], [153], [161]
- WHEAT, supply of, Runciman, W., [172]
- WHITSUN holiday, postponement, Asquith, H. H., [134]
- PARSONS, Hon. Sir C. A., member of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, 4
- PASTURE, G. G. Ducarel, Marq. de la, Obit., 156
- PAUL, E. and C., "Treitschke's History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century," translated by, 93
- PAYNE, J., Obit., 160
- PEACE Conference at Cardiff, [184]
- insurance on, 10, 11, 13, 25
- overtures from Germany, [203], [209]; reply of the Allies, [211], [214]
- PEACOCKE, Dr. J. F., Obit., 171
- PEARSON, Prof. H. H. W., Obit., 194
- PEASE, Rt. Hon. J. A., appointed Postmaster-General, 2
- PEASE, P., appointed Assistant Postmaster-General, [200]
- PEEL, Dr. W. G., Obit., 167
- PEERAGES conferred, Aitken, Sir M., 25; Astor, W. W., 1; Beresford, Lord C., 1; Boyd, Mr. Justice, 10; Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H., 10; Coats, G., 14; Colston, Mr., 14; Crossley, Sir S., 14; Dewar, Sir J. A., 25; Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L., 25; Henderson, Sir A., 1; Mosley, T., 14; Nicolson, Sir A., 14; Norton, Capt. C., 1; Partington, Sir E., 25; Pease, Rt. Hon. J. A., 25; Roe, Sir T., 25; Shaughnessy, Sir D. T., 1; Stuart-Wortley, Rt. Hon. C., 25; Thomas, D. A., 1
- PEET, W. H., Obit., 201
- PELHAM, Hon. T. H. W., Obit., 205
- PENSIONS, Board of, established, [185]
- PERKIN, Prof. W. H., appointed head of the Research Department of British Dyes, 2
- PERKINS, W. T., appointed Editor of "Hansard," 24
- PERSIA.—ISPAHAN, captured, [299], 8. RUSSIANS and Turks, military operations, [299]. Russo-British agreement, [298]
- PETROL, restrictions on the supply, 4, 18
- PEYTON, Sir A. F., Obit., 167
- PHILLIMORE, Rt. Hon. Sir W., Lord Justice of Appeal, resignation, 21
- PHILLIPS, Col. V. W., Obit., 190
- PICTURE, sale of, 13
- PIGOU, Very Rev. F., Dean of Bristol, Obit., 155
- PILGRIMS' Club, meeting, [190]
- PINKEY, Lieut.-Col. Sir A. F., Obit., 166
- POHL, Rear-Adm. von, Obit., 160
- POLAND.—BESELER, General von, proclamation, [270]. INDEPENDENCE, [253], [260], [269]. LUBLIN, Austro-Hungarian administration at, [269]. WARSAW, German administration at, [269].
- POLLARD, F., Obit., 183
- PONSONBY, Lady, Obit., 192
- PORTAL, Col. W., in command of the "Household Battalion," 23

- PORTUGAL.—AFRICA, East, campaign in, [290]. Almeida, Dr., Prime Minister. [290]. GERMAN steamers, seized, [290], 6. WAR, declaration, [290], 7
- POST Offices, open for subscriptions to Exchequer Bonds, 2
- POWER, Sir J. T., Obit., 177
- POWER, Sir W., Obit., 181
- POWERSCOURT, Viscount, Knight of the Order of St. Patrick, 4
- POWELL, F., Obit., 156
- PRAGNELL, Sir G., Obit., 159
- PRATT, J. W., appointed Lord of the Treasury, [201]
- PRETYMAN, E. G., appointed Civil Lord of the Admiralty, [200]
- PRICE, Sir T. R., Obit., 190
- PRIMROSE, Hon. N., Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Munitions, [149]; to the Treasury, [201]
- PRINZING, Dr. F., "Epidemics Resulting from Wars," 103
- PRISONERS of war, exchange of, [159], [179]; number, 4, 19; treatment in Germany, [104], [146]
- PRIVY Councillorships conferred, Barnes, G. N., 1; Crooks, W., 1
- PROTHERO, Rt. Hon. R. E., appointed President of the Board of Agriculture, [199], [200]
- PUBLIC Documents, 27-38
- PURDIE, Prof. T., Obit., 204
- PUREY-CUST, Very Rev. A. P., Obit., 206
- QUEEN'S Hall, meetings, [110], [159]
- QUEENINGTON, Viscountess, Obit., 162
- QUILLER-COUCH, Sir A., "On the Art of Writing," 105
- RAILWAY Companies, and London General Omnibus Co., combine agreed upon, 3
- RAILWAYMEN, demands of, [166]
- RAMSAY, A. B., appointed Lower Master of Eton, 17
- RAMSAY, Sir W., Obit., 180
- RANKSBOROUGH, Lord, appointed Lord-in-Waiting, [201]
- READING, Lord, created Viscount, 14
- RECRUITING Conference, at the War Office, [87]; report on, [107]; scheme of substitution, [181]
- RECRUITS, policy of "rounding up," [169]; re-examination, 21
- REDESDALE, Lord, Obit., 183
- REDFORD, G. A., Obit., 196
- REDMOND, J., on the proposals for the settlement of Ireland, [140]; at Waterford, [170]
- REFORM Club, meeting, [198]
- REHAN, A., Obit., 154
- REID, C., Obit., 203
- REID, Sir M. F., appointed a member of the Council of India, 8
- REPRISALS, policy of, views against, 5
- RETRENCHMENT Committee, report, [64], [72]
- REUTER'S Telegram Co., sale of, 24
- REVENUE, estimated, [99], [100]
- REW, Sir H., appointed Secretary to the Ministry of Food, 26
- RHONDDA, Lord, appointed President of the Local Government Board, [199], [200]

- RICK, Sir C. S., G.C.M.G., conferred, 14
 RICHARDS, H. P., Obit., 180
 RICHTER, Dr. H., Obit., 202
 RIDLEY, Viscount, Obit., 159
 RILEY, J. W., Obit., 180
 RIVINGTONS, publication of "Nationality as a Factor in Modern History," 95
 ROBERTS, G. H., appointed Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Trade, [200]
 ROBERTSON, Sir G. S., Obit. 153
 ROBERTSON, Gen. Sir W., at the Paris Conference, [96]; at Dalderby, [170]; on the military situation, [177]; at York House, 23; member of the Army Council, 26
 ROBINSON, Lieut. W. L., awarded the V.C., 20
 ROCHFORD, Maj.-Gen. Sir A. N., Obit., 202
 ROLLO, Lord, Obit., 190
 ROLLS, Hon. H. A., Obit., 175
 RONALDSHAY, Earl of, appointed Governor of Bengal, 24
 ROSE, J. H., "Nationality as a Factor in Modern History," 95
 ROSEBURY, Lord, at Edinburgh, 23
 ROTHEMERRE, Lord, appointed Director-General of the Royal Army Clothing Department, 21
 ROUND, J., Obit., 206
 ROYAL Academy, election of Associates, 4; exhibition, 136
 — Defence Corps, formation, 8
 — Flying Corps, report of the Committee, [158]
 — Pensions Fund Corporation, meeting, 2
 — Society, meeting, 126; award of medals, 126
 — Society of Arts, award of the Albert Medal, 16
 ROYDS, Col. Sir C., Obit., 156
 RUDD, C. D., Obit., 197
 RUMANIA. — ARMY, defeat of the, [45], [277]. Austria-Hungary, war declared against, [36], [40], [276], 19. Birth-rate, [276]. Bukarest, fall, [47], [196], [277], 24. CRAIOVA occupied, [46], 24. IRREDENTISM, [276]. MILITARY operations, [40]-[47]. NEUTRALITY, policy of, [240], [275]
 — Queen Elizabeth of, Obit., 162
 RUMBOLD, Sir H., appointed Envoy-Extraordinary at Berne, 19
 RUNCIMAN, Rt. Hon. W., temporary absence from the Board of Trade, 13
 RUNDLE, Sir H. M. L., General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, resignation, 13
 RUSSELL, Hon. B., fined, 14; result of his conviction, 17
 RUSSELL, Dr. C., Obit., 205
 RUSSIA. — ALEXIEFF, General, Chief of the Staff, [14]. BRIBERY, prosecution for, Bill, [263]. Budget, [261]. CHKHEIDZE, M., criticism on the policy of the Government, [260]. Constitutional Democratic Congress, proclamation, [261]. Duma, "Progressive Bloc," [257], [261]; opened, [259], [267]. 6; legislation, [263]; reassembled, [267]. FINLAND, [265]. GOREMYKIN, M., Prime Minister, resignation, [259]. JAPAN, treaty with, [309]. Jews, regulations, [264]. Journalists, in England, 6. KHVOSTOFF, M., resignation, [262]; Minister of the Interior, [265]. LOAN, issue of a, [261]. MAKAROFF, M., Minister of Justice, [265]. MILULOFF, M., on the fate of the Dardanelles, [263]. Military operations in the East, [1], [8], [14]-[19], [35]. Monarchist Congresses, [258]. PEACE, proposals, [210], [268]. Peasants, rights to, [263]. PEKROVSKY, M., Foreign Minister, [269]. Poland, protest against the action of Germany, [271]. POLIVANOFF, General, resignation, [262]; in command on the Strypa, 11. Population, [3]. Prisoners, number of, [15], [16], [17]. PROTOPOFF, M., Minister of the Interior, [266]. RAILWAY construction, [266]. SAZONOFF, M., foreign policy, [259]; resignation, [264], 17; M.G.C.B., conferred, 18. SHUVAIEFF, General, Minister of War, [262], 9. STIRMER, M., Prime Minister, [259]; policy, [259]; Foreign Minister, [264]; Grand Chamberlain, [267]. SUKHOMLINOFF, General, arrested, [263]. TREPOFF, M., Prime Minister, [267], 21; policy, [267]. WAR casualties, [3]-[7], [17], [47]; expenditure, [261].
 Nicholas II, Czar of, at the opening of the Duma, [259]; title of Field-Marshal, conferred, 1
 SAMUEL, Rt. Hon. H., appointed Home Secretary, 2; on the output of coal, [178]
 SAMUELL, W., Obit., 144
 SANDARS, Judge L., Obit., 162
 SANDHURST, Lord, appointed Lord Chamberlain of the Household, [200]
 SANDWICH, Earl of, Obit., 175
 SANT, J., Obit., 138, 178
 SASSON, Sir J. E., Obit., 193
 SAWYER, Canon, appointed Head Master of Shrewsbury School, 22
 SCARSDALE, Baron, Obit., 164
 SCHÜDDERHOFF, Dr. A. W., Obit., 187
 SCIENCE.—Retrospect of, 123-133
 SOLENOE, meeting to protest against the neglect of, 12, 124
 SOLATER, Lieut.-Gen. Sir H., Commander-in-Chief of the Southern Command, 6; G.C.B., conferred, 6
 SCOBLE, Rt. Hon., Sir A. R., Obit., 155
 SCOTLAND. — EDINBURGH University, Ewing, Sir J. A., appointed Principal, 13. GLASGOW, Engineering and Shipbuilding industries, Conference, 18. MILITARY area, restrictions, 18. MONTROSS, Duke of, Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly, 12. MORISON, T. B., Solicitor-General, [199]
 SCOTT, Sir P., in command of the defences of London, [67]
 SCOTT-MONCRIEFF, Sir C., Obit., 166
 SORUTON, Hon. Mr. Justice, appointed Lord Justice of Appeal, 21
 SEA-plane raids, British, [21], 9; German, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 18, 20; shot down, 22
 SELBORNE, Lord, at the London School of Economics, [89]; resigns Presidency of the Board of Agriculture, [141], 16
 SELOUS, Capt. F. C., D.S.O., conferred, 20

- SERBIA.—ALEXANDER, Prince, in London, [281], 9. MILITARY operations, 34. Monastir, reconquered, [35], [281], 23. WAR, casualties, [7]; result of the, [281]
- SHACKLETON, Sir E., his expedition to the South Pole, 13, 132
- SHAW, B., "Androules and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion," 111
- SHAW, Sir J. D., Obit., 196
- SHELL shock, study of, 130
- SHIPLEY, A. E., "More Minor Horrors," 110
- SHIPPING, 149-151; estimate of losses, 12
- Controller, appointment of a, [199], 150
- SHIPPING DISASTERS.—*Alania*, 22; *Alcantara*, 6; *Arabia*, 23; *Arethusa*, 5; *Barque*, British, 10; *Bargentine*, Russian, 10; *Batavier V.*, 13; *Berwindvale*, [330]; *Black Prince*, [26]; *Braemar Castle*, 24; *Britannic*, 24; *Connemara*, 23; *Conquest*, cutter, 9; *Coquette*, 8; *Cymric*, [21], 12; *Defence*, [26]; *Duke of Albany*, 19; *Eagle Point*, [330]; *Eden*, 15; *Elbing*, [25]; *Englishman*, [330]; *Palmouth*, [39]; *Fanette*, 8; *Flirt*, [39]; *Foucault*, 2; *Franconia*, 21; *Frauenlob*, [25]; *Galia*, 21; *Galloperlightship*, 9; *Gaulois*, [39], 26; *Geelong*, 1; *Genista*, 22; *German destroyers*, 9; *Glengyle*, 1; *Hampshire*, [185], 14; *Indefatigable*, [23]; *Industry*, 12; *Invincible*, [24]; *King Edward VII.*, 2; *Lützow*, [25]; *Malaja*, 6; *Manchester Engineer*, [330]; *Medusa*, [21]; *Minneapolis*, 9; *Norwegian vessels*, 11; *Nottingham*, [39]; *Nubian*, [39]; *Palembang*, [285]; *Pommern*, [25]; *Prinula*, 7; *Principe de Asturias*, 7; *Provence II.*, 6; *Queen Mary*, [21]; *Retriever*, 23; *Rustock*, [25]; *Russell*, 12; *Simla*, 10; *Steamers*, British, 10, 11; *Submarine E 17*, 1; *E 22*, 11; *German*, 12; *Sussex*, [330], 9, 46, 49; *Torpedo boats*, 8, 25; *Tubantia*, [285], 8; *Warrior*, [26]; *Westfalen*, [39], 19; *Wiesbaden*, [25]
- SHKLOVSKY, I. W., "In Far North-East Siberia," 109
- SHOPS, early closing of, [179]
- SHREWSBURY School, Sawyer, Canon, appointed Head Master, 22
- SIENKIEWICZ, H., Obit., 197
- SIMON, Sir J., Home Secretary, resignation, [49], 2
- SIMPSON, Sir A., Obit., 166
- SINTON, Capt. J. A., awarded the V.C., 15
- SIVEWRIGHT, Sir J., Obit., 187
- SKEFFINGTON, S., Commission on the case of, [175]
- SLINGSBY, C. E. E., case of, 8, 25
- SMITH, A. L., elected Master of Balliol, 12
- SMITH, Second Lieut. A. V., awarded the V.C., 7
- SMITH, C., Obit., 196
- SMITH, E. A., Obit., 180
- SMITH, Elder & Co., publication of, "A Great Success," 112; "More Minor Horrors," 110; "The Triumph of Time," 118
- SMITH, Sir F. E., appointed Attorney-General, [199]
- SMITH, R. J., Obit., 206
- SMITH-DORRIEN, Sir H., in command of the troops in E. Africa, resignation, 4
- SNOWSTORMS, in England, 6, 7, 9
- SOWBEY, Second Lieut., F., D.S.O., conferred, 21
- SPAIN.—BUDGET, [289]. ELECTION, General, result, [288]. NEUTRALITY, policy of, [288]. PARLIAMENT, the new, opened, [289]. Peace, views on, [289]. STRIKE, [289]. VALENCIA, floods, [289]
- Alfonso XIII., King of, at the opening of Parliament, [289]
- SPIERS, R. P., Obit., 191
- SPY, execution of a, 10
- STAINER, Lady, Obit., 186
- ST. ALDWYN, Earl, Obit., 168
- Standard, The, suspends publication, 8
- STANLEY, Sir A., appointed President of the Board of Trade, [199], [200], [202]
- STANMORE, Lord, appointed Lord-in-Waiting, [201]
- STANTON, Dr. V. H., elected Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, 4
- STEEL-MAITLAND, R., appointed Under-Secretary of the Colonies, [200]
- STEFANOU, D., Obit., 196
- STEIN, Sir A., result of his expedition, 132
- STEYN, Ex-President, M. T., Obit., [315], 200
- STIRLING, Sir J., Obit., 176
- STOCK Exchange, German refused re-election, 14
- STOKES, Sir A. R., Obit., 174
- STONE, Rev. E. D., Obit., 188
- "STOP the war demonstration," 2
- STOPFORD, Col. L. A. M., appointed Commandant of the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, 20
- STORMS, in England, S., 23; London, 23
- STRACHAN-DAVIDSON, J. L., Obit., 164
- STRIKES, Boilermakers, Liverpool, [203]; Clyde, [94]-[96]
- STURGEH, Count, Obit., [252], 22, 193
- SUFFIELD, Lord, appointed Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard, [200]
- SUMMER Time Act, in operation, 13; at an end, 21
- SUN, partial Eclipse of the, 4
- SURREY, restrictions in the sale of liquor, 17
- SUSSEX, restrictions in the sale of liquor, 17
- SUTHERLAND, Duke of, gift of land, [157]
- SWEDEN.—BUDGET, [296]. CHRISTIANIA, Scandinavian Conference at, [296], [297]. EXPORTS, British, restrictions on, 19. GERMANOPHIL party, [292]. Great Britain, relations with, [294], [296], 19. HAMMARSKJÖLD, Mr., on the war, [295]. MAILS, seizure of, [296]. NEUTRAL Peace Conference, at Stockholm, [295]. Neutrality, policy of, [292], [293]. PEACE Note, [296]. RIKSDAG, opened, [293]. Russia, enmity with, [292], [296]
- Gustav V., King of, at the opening of the Riksdag, [293]

- SWITZERLAND.—EGLI, Col., prosecution, [286]; acquitted, [287]. GERMANY, Economic Convention with, [287]. NEUTRALITY, policy of, [286]. PEACE negotiations, [211], [288]. SCHULTESS, Herr E., elected President, [287]
- SYDENHAM, Lord, resignation, 26
- SZÖGYENY-MARICH, Count, Obit., 174
- TALBOT, Lord E., appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury, [201]
- TAKES, first use of, [34], 20
- TAKES, the new, [99]
- TEIGNMOUTH, Baron, Obit., 203
- TEMPEST, Second Lieut. W. J., D.S.O., conferred, 22
- TENNANT, Rt. Hon. H. J., appointed Secretary for Scotland, [149], 17
- TENNYSON, Lady, Obit., 202
- THEREBAW, Ex-King, Obit., 205
- THEOTOKIS, G., Obit., 155
- THOMPSON, Prof. S. P., Obit., 174
- THOMSON, Prof. E., awarded the Hughes Medal, 126
- THOMSON, Sir J. J., re-elected President of the Royal Society, 126
- THORBURN, A., "British Birds," 91
- THURLOW, Lord, Obit., 163
- THWAITES, Rev. W., Obit., 194
- THYNNE, Lady U., Obit., 156
- Times*, The, announcements in, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26; on the closing of Museums, [64]; article in, [118]; on the treatment of British prisoners, [179]; Red Cross Society, amount of fund, 16, 23; increase in the price, 23
- TISDALL, Sub-Lieut. A. W. S., awarded the V.C., 9
- TOBACCO, importation of, Committee, [69], 5, 6
- TOMPSON, Maj.-Gen. W. D., Obit., 203
- TOSTI, Sir F. P., Obit., 201
- TOWNSEND, Gen., surrenders at Kut, [274], 12; K.C.B., conferred, 22
- TRADE policy after the war, Conference in Paris, [89]; Committee on, [154], [157]
- Union Congress, at Birmingham, [167]-[169]; Glasgow, [117], 12
- Unions, meeting of delegates, [208]
- TRADES, meeting of representatives, 17
- TRAFALGAR Square, meeting, 10
- "TRAINING Reserve," Infantry corps formed, 18
- TREITSCHKE, H. von, "History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century," 93
- TSCHIRSCHKY, Herr von, Obit., 197
- TURKEY.—ARABIA, revolt, [274], 15; Mecca, Sherief Hussein, proclaimed Sultan, [275], 15. Armenia, campaign, [36], [272]. DARDANELLES, military operations, 36; evacuation, 37-45. GALLIPOLI, evacuation, [272], 1, 31-45. KUT, siege of, [273]; surrender, [274]. MESOPOTAMIA, military operations, [273], 5, 7, 11. TRIPLE Alliance, [274]. YUSSUF IZZ-ED-DIN, Prince, commits suicide, 3, 157
- TURNER, Rt. Hon. Sir G., Obit., 183
- TURNER, Sir W., Obit., 159
- TUSON, Gen. Sir H. B., Obit., 205
- TWINING, S., Obit., 182
- UNDERWOOD, A. S., Obit., 201
- UNIONIST War Committee, [88]; in favour of universal compulsion, [105], [107]
- UNITED STATES.—BAKER, N. D., War Secretary, [343]. FINANCE, [342]. GARRISON, L. M., Secretary of War, resignation, [343]. 4. Germany, controversy with [325]-[333]; declaration against armed merchantmen, [327]-[329]. Great Britain, relations with, [323]-[325], [338]. Grey, Sir E., memorandum, [334]-[338]. HUGHES, Judge, candidate for the Presidency, [340], 15. MAINS, seizure of, [323], [333]. Mexico, relations with, [350]. Navy, construction of ships, [343]. "Peace, League to Enforce," [342]. Peace note, [210], [224], [247], [343]; reply of the Allies [211]-[214]. Presidential Election, candidates, [338]-[340]; result, [341]. ROOSEVELT, T., candidate for the Presidency, [339]. SUBMARINES, losses from, [330]. *Sussex*, case of the, [330], [331], 45. WILSON, President, on the rights of Americans, [326]; threat to resign, [327]; on the submarine warfare, [331], 45-53; ultimatum to Germany, [331]; candidate for the Presidency, [339], 15; elected, [341]; at the "League to Enforce Peace," [342]; Message, [343]; Peace note, [210], [224], [247], [343]
- UNIVERSAL compulsory military service, demand for, [88], [105]; proposed, [205], [206]
- VACHELL, H. A., "The Triumph of Time," 118
- VALENTIA, Viscount, appointed Lord-in-Waiting, [201]
- VENEREAL Diseases, Report on, 27-31, 130
- VERHAAREN, E., Obit., 200
- VERNON-JONES, Dr., Obit., 187
- VETCH, Col. R. H., Obit., 156
- VICTORIA Crosses, award of, 9, 18, 20, 23
- VINCENT, Sir W. H., appointed member of the Executive Council of India, 24
- VOLPE, Cardinal D., Obit., 195
- VORONTZOFF-DASHKOFF, Count I. I., Obit., 157
- WAHLSTATT, Prince G. B. von, Obit., 178
- WAKE, Sir H., Obit., 153
- WALDSTEIN, Sir C., "Aristodemocracy," 101
- WALES, H.R.H. Edward, Prince of, at the Royal Pension Committee, 2; in Egypt, [321], 8
- WALES.—CARDIFF, Peace Conference at, [184]; railwaymen, demands, [166]. Coalfield, regulation, [191]. MINERS' Federation, demands, [194]
- WALLACE, Sir W., Obit., 177
- WALLIS, T., Obit., 168
- WALSH, S., appointed Lord of the Treasury, [201]
- WAR Cabinet, members, [199]
- Committee, members, [196]
- Conference of the Empire, [214]
- WAR, The European, [1], 18; military operations in the West, [1], [9], [27]-[32], [34]; in the East, [1], [8], [14]-[18], [35]; of attrition, [3]-[7], [47];

- casualties, [3]-[7], [31], 1; the battle of Verdun, [9]-[11]; Austro-Hungarian operations against Italy, [11]-[13], [32]-[34], [35]; Russian offensive in June, [14]-[19]; at Sea, [19]-[27], [38]; Franco-British offensive in July, [27]-[32]; conquest of Gorizia, [32]-[34]; Balkan campaign, [35]; in the Air, [36]-[38]; Rumanian campaign, [40]-[47]
- War expenditure, [65], [71], [127], [207], [231]; issue of certificates, 14, 16, 146
- Savings, National Organising Committee for, 4, 5; meeting at the Guildhall, [73]
- WARD, Chief Detective-Inspector A., Obit., 189
- WARD, Sir A. W., "Germany, 1815-1890," 92
- WARD, Mrs. H., "A Great Success," 112
- WARD, W., Obit., 166
- WARD, Sir W. E., Obit., 206
- WARNER, G. T., Obit., 189
- WARRE-CORNISH, F., Obit., 185
- WATSON, Col. Sir C. M., Obit., 163
- WAXWEILER, E., Obit., 175
- WAY, Sir S., Obit., 153
- WEBSTER, Col. A. G., Obit., 171
- WESTMINSTER, Central Hall, meeting, [208]
- WESTMORLAND, Brig.-Gen. C. H., Obit., 158
- WEYMOUTH, Viscount, Obit., 153
- WHEAT, price of, 1, 23, 149; Commission on the supply, [172]
- WHIGHAM, Maj.-Gen. R. D., member of the Army Council, 26
- WHIT-Monday Bank Holiday, postponed, 13, 14
- WHITE, Sir G., Obit., 199
- WHITE, Lady, Obit., 204
- WHITE, M., Obit., 168
- WHITTINGTON, Col. G. J. C., Obit., 166
- WILBERFORCE, Ven. Archdeacon A. B. O., Obit., 170
- WILLIAMS & Norgate, publication of, "Writings by L. P. Jacks," 107
- WILLIAMS, Sir R. V., Obit., 203
- WILSON, Sir C. R., Obit., 158
- WILSON, Lady, Obit., 153
- WIMBORNE, Lord, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, resignation, [128]; reappointed, [146], [199], 18; on conscription in Ireland, [170]
- WINDHAM, Adm. C., Obit., 171
- WINFREY, Sir R., appointed Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Agriculture, [200]
- WISE, B. K., Obit., 189
- WOLFF, Lady D., Obit., 165
- WOMEN, Hospital for, opened at Clapham Common, 16
- WOMEN'S Suffrage Federation, meeting broken up, 10
- WOOD, T. M., appointed Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, [149], 17
- WOODALL, Sir C., Obit., 171
- WOODFORD-FINDEN, Brigade Surgeon Lieut.-Col. W., Obit., 163
- WORTHINGTON, A. M., Obit., 202
- WOUTERS, R., Obit., 180
- WYNDHAM, Sir H., Obit., 158
- YARMOUTH, bombarded by German war-ships, [119], 11
- YERBURGH, R. A., Obit., 204
- YUAN-SHIH-KAI, Obit., [308], 173
- YUSSUF IZZ-ED-DIN, Prince, Obit., 3, 157
- ZEPPELIN raids, [37], 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 18, 21, 24; destruction of, [33], 3, 5, 9, 12, 21

